

BL 2727

.M35

1882





PRESS NOTICES.

That the public may see the estimate in which this work is held, the Publisher has collected the following notices of the first edition :

Washington Post.

"ANSWERS TO INGERSOLL.—A Virginia layman takes issue with the 'Great Infidel.' A majority of the replies to Ingersoll are of a character to make us wish that the writer had not undertaken the task. This cannot be honestly said of Mr. Magruder's book. * * He seems possessed of a quick insight into the weak points of his opponent, and knows how to present them to the best advantage. * * Not the least interesting chapter in the book is the argument that eternal punishment is not eternal pain, etc. * * Mr. Magruder presents his case in a strong light."

Laurinburgh (N.C.) Enterprise.

"We have received from the publishers the 'Reply to Robert G. Ingersoll's Lectures' against the Bible, written by Allan B. Magruder, a lawyer of ability and a gentleman who has diligently searched the Scriptures. 'His defense is able, and his hits at the great infidel are calculated to make him wince, if not to confess the transparency of the doctrine which he proclaims against the Bible and its precepts. Ingersoll is a smart man and *ergo* a dangerous one, but he has met a foeman in Mr. Magruder worthy of his steel.'"

Lenoir (N. C.) Topic.

"We have just received the 'Reply to Robert J. Ingersoll's Lectures,' by Allan B. Magruder, which is a full exposition of Ingersoll's inconsistencies and ignorance of the Bible as

PRESS NOTICES.

well as a beautiful and convincing argument for the truth of the Bible teachings. It should not only be in the hand of the minister, but in that of every Bible reader."

Wadesboro' (N. C.) Times.

"We have received from the Publishers a book, entitled 'Reply to Robert G. Ingersoll's Lectures,' by Allan B. Magruder. We deprecate any attempt at a reply to such a blasphemous infidel, and believe all efforts of the kind but tend to advertise and cause to be read his atheistical teachings. The book is very neatly gotten up, and the author says, 'It is to defend the Bible as the Word of God and an authentic Divine revelation to man that these pages are written.' *

* No apology is needed to those who reverence the Bible as the Word of God, for this attempt to defend that Word and to confute the sophistry of one whose life is spent in laborious efforts to impeach and villify the Divine oracles."

Advent Advocate (Iowa).

"Since receiving Mr. Magruder's book we have not had time to read it, but we like it very much as we read its introduction and first chapter, and we doubt not that the work will find a ready reception with the people as a defense of the Bible from this bold attack of infidelity. As the author takes the Bible view of the nature and destiny of man the answer to Ingersoll is the more valuable."

Charlotte (N. C.) Democrat.

"* * It is a reply to Bob Ingersoll's infidel lectures, and should be in the hands of all, especially those who have paid any attention to Ingersoll's blasphemous talk and writings. Ask for the book at the city book stores."

Christian Chiliast (Del.).

"It is a strong defense of our Bible, and an able attack on the fortress of infidelity. The author has rebuked atheism with peculiar force and true logic, exposing the effrontery and supreme ignorance of Ingersoll respecting a book the divinity of which skeptics cannot disannul and apostacy cannot ob-

PRESS NOTICES.

scure. Of the numerous replies to this atheist we believe this one the best, as the author is in the position enabling him to take the infidel bull by the horns and back him to the wall and over. There is no cringing at the scathing shafts which Ingersoll hurls against false creeds—the Book stands on its own merits, and not on the fables of paganism—and our author not only maintains the Bible as a God-given guide to direct man into the path of life, but scripturally shows that everlasting conscious torment is not a teaching of the blessed Book. We would be glad to have all our readers obtain a copy of this defense of truth. The author has, in this work, made a valuable contribution to a Christian's library, and his clear and successful defense, coupled with an aggressive advance and truthful exhibition of the sublime doctrine of life only in Christ, will place his work in high estimation."

Winchester (Va.) Times.

"In this able vindication of the claims of the Bible, Mr. Magruder has achieved with the pen as complete a victory over the bold blasphemer, Ingersoll, as he would have done in public discussion, had not the latter discreetly declined the controversy."

Bible Standard [England].

"In a former issue we drew attention to the response made by Mr. Magruder to the bold challenge of Col. R. Ingersoll, a noted American infidel lecturer. As Mr. Magruder's acceptance of the challenge was not heeded, "The Bible Defended and Atheism Rebuked" was issued from the press, and we are glad to hear that it has met with a good sale in the States. The author writes in a good spirit, but hits hard, and cleverly exposes the many weak places in his opponent's armor. But for the pressure on our space we should quote from the work, but must be content with a brief line of praise."

The Restitution [Ind.]

"We find the following notice of Brother Magruder's book in the November number of the *Messenger*, published at Glasgow, Scotland. The notice of the work is very favorable, but

PRESS NOTICES.

by no means unmerited: 'Brother A. B. Magruder, of Stephens City, U. S., has just published an excellent treatise in reply to the American champion of unbelief—Ingersoll—which will repay perusal. He wisely protests against the habit which Ingersoll has of confounding Scripture doctrine with human systems of theology; and takes occasion, while pointing out the infidel's blunders, to set forth clearly the true Scripture doctrine on immortality and the kingdom of God.'"

The Churchman. [Episcopal.]

"In this volume Mr. Magruder, a lawyer of Virginia, who vainly challenged Mr. Ingersoll to a public discussion, enters into an examination of his printed lectures. No man lays himself more open to refutation than Mr. Ingersoll; he halts on both feet in his facts and in his arguments, and we need not say that Mr. Magruder's task was as easy as his work was effective. Coming from a lawyer, and looking at matters from the stand-point of a layman, his work will be read where, perhaps, the clergyman could gain no hearing, and it will be useful to those who are carried away by Mr. Ingersoll's rollicking rhetoric and are likely to lose their bearings. It seems incredible, but it is doubtless true, that there are many who are weak enough to be influenced by the infidel's loud assertions, and to such, if they are willing to hear the other side, Mr. Magruder's book and Judge Black's argument may be of service."

Our Rest and Signs of the Times [Chicago].

"This is a well-written book, and exposes the twaddle of Ingersoll in a marked manner. The author is not evangelical in his views concerning the nature of man, but believes in his present mortal condition, subject to a change to immortality by his resurrection at Christ's coming. Neither does he endorse the doctrine of eternal hell torment, believing that it is not taught in the Scriptures. The author accepted Ingersoll's challenge for discussion, but when the braggart saw that he was confronted by one who meant what he said, he ignominiously retreated, like the skulking coward that he is. He dare

PRESS NOTICES.

not mount the rostrum and fight this battle with one who has the courage and ability to defend the authenticity of the Scriptures. That has been proven."

Sabbath Advocate. [Marion, Ia.—Advent.]

"REPLY TO INGERSOLL.—'The Bible Defended and Atheism Rebuked,' by Allan B. Magruder, is received from the Publishers. This pamphlet of 142 pages is a Reply to Robert G. Ingersoll's Lectures against the Bible, on the 'Mistakes of Moses,' 'Skulls,' 'What must I Do to Be Saved?' and other defamations of the Bible. Since receiving the book we have not had time to read it, but we like it very much as we read its introduction and first chapter, and we doubt not that the work will find a ready reception with the people as a defense of the Bible from this bold attack of infidelity. As the author takes the Bible view of the nature and destiny of man, the answer is the more valuable."

Philadelphia Enquirer.

"E. J. Hale & Son, New York, have published a thick pamphlet, by Allan B. Magruder, containing "A Reply to Ingersoll's Lectures," in which the flippant arguments and frequent misrepresentations of the eloquent but unscrupulous infidel are handled with much skill."

Winchester News. [Va.]

"A Reply to Ingersoll.—We have been favored by the Publisher with a copy of Mr. A. B. Magruder's reply to Col. R. G. Ingersoll's lectures attacking the Bible. It is a very neatly printed volume. We have not read the entire book, but from what we have seen of it we think that Mr. Magruder treats his subject with much system and ability. He is "very cunning of fence," and shows conclusively that Col. Ingersoll has found a foeman worthy of his steel. There are proofs everywhere in the reply that Mr. Magruder has made the Bible a deep study."

New York Herald.

"The Bible Defended and Atheism Rebuked."—This is the

OPINIONS, ETC.

title of a pamphlet sent us by the publishers, from the pen of Allan B. Magruder, Layman and Bible Student, and is intended as a reply to some of the lectures of Mr. Robert J. Ingersoll. Mr. Magruder knows his Bible well, and makes good use of his knowledge. The pamphlet will be useful."

OPINIONS OF EMINENT CITIZENS, MINISTERS, SCHOLARS, ETC., ETC.

Besides these notices of the public press, the author received numerous commendations of the work from eminent citizens, embracing lawyers, judges, doctors, and scholars, college presidents and professors, and from ministers and clergymen of various denominations, many of whom were unknown to him. As these were contained generally in private letters, he did not feel at liberty, without special authority, to make them public with their names attached, helpful as it would be to the sale of the work. But the Publisher feels that there is no violation of confidence in quoting these favorable opinions of the work, suppressing the names, etc., of the writers. The following presents some of the testimonials taken from the originals :

"The book is an opportune and able utterance."

"I congratulate you on the success and perfection of your work."

" * * * * I cannot close this letter without expressing the opinion that there is nothing in *Junius* equal to your pen portrait of Ingersoll, and, were I competent to criticism of your whole reply, it would be in the main commendatory."

OPINIONS, ETC.

"I believe, if generally read, it would be productive of much good. Mr. Ingersoll's main props are clearly taken from under him by showing, in a lucid manner, the true teaching of the Bible. * * I feel confident, if he is an honest man and *can conquer his pride* he will acknowledge himself convinced. But I fear the 'if' is in the way. * * The reply is well written, points strongly taken, and the arguments forcible and conclusive."

"I have read the book through. I expected something good and am not disappointed. * * I only wish all intelligent people could see and read it. I have ordered forty copies of the work from the Publishers."

"I have read your answer with no little care and attention, and I can add that I think, without doubt, you have made a very able argument, and have fully refuted the sophistry (to call it by no harsher name) of Mr Ingersoll."

"I regard your reply to Ingersoll as highly creditable to your head and heart. I admire it for its intellectual force and for its zeal, and I do not say that I agree with you as to some secondary points, but your pamphlet, as an argument in behalf of Christianity, is, in my opinion, an able and effectual review of the blasphemous teachings of your opponent. I hear that Judge —— has complimented your book."

"I hear a new edition of your Reply to Ingersoll will be issued. This accords with the wish of my heart. We need such a work at the present time, when Infidelity is assuming a bold and defiant attitude toward the Bible and Christianity. It should be put into the hands of all persons who can be induced to read, especially of the young men of our country, many of whom seem to be abandoning the old Book on the flimsy pretext that it is a crude human production of an unenlightened and superstitious age."

"I should be most happy, if I had the means, to place the Reply to Ingersoll in the hands of every intelligent man in the land. If you had failed to point out the true way and confined yourself simply to refuting Ingersoll's absurd charges, your book would have lost half its value. Ingersoll rejects the Bible, but offers nothing instead. You have sustained the divinity of the Bible, and through it pointed out the way to future life and salvation."

"I have just read your Reply to Ingersoll. It interested and greatly gratified me. A short time since a friend sent me

OPINIONS, ETC.

his book on a somewhat kindred subject; and just before yours. I read the discussion in the *North American Review*, between Ingersoll and Black. Permit me to say that while my esteemed friend, in my opinion, missed the mark widely, and the Pennsylvania lawyer came only a little closer, *you have hit it in the white*. For several years it has been my firmly fixed belief that *contingent* immortality is the clearly revealed doctrine of Scripture. * * * The sympathy of views on that great subject prompts this expression of it to you, and I trust will be regarded as a sufficient apology from an entire stranger."

"I have just read, with great interest and with general satisfaction, your reply to Mr. Ingersoll, entitled, 'The Bible Defended and Atheism Rebuked.'"

"I have very sincerely to thank you for your thoughtful kindness in sending me a copy of your reply to Ingersoll's lectures. His lectures are mainly made up of sneers, sarcasms, inuendos, and against such *ad captandum* flings, it is difficult to argue, because they address a lower part of our nature than the reason and the conscience; but as far as any argumentation of his can be made to revolve in the sphere of logic, you have shown that it is untenable, and, in so doing, have deserved the thanks of the Christian public."

"I have read it with pleasure and satisfaction as a logical and thorough exposure of Ingersoll's fallacies, and have started it on its mission of enlightenment to others who are awaiting the opportunity of reading it."

"I have read the book with great interest. I am pleased, and somewhat surprised, to find your views so nearly in accord with my own, as set forth in various publications. Perhaps you have seen some of them, but not my last work just now being published. I venture to send it to you by this mail, because I think you will be glad to have it, etc. * * * I hope your work will have a large circulation. I shall take pleasure in commending it to others."

"I have just given your book its first reading, and will say that my expectations have been more than realized, for I regard the work as the most triumphant vindication of the Word of God that has yet appeared. The great beauty of your defense is that *the book stands upon its own merits*. How my heart has been pained at the miserable apologies that have been made by some of the clergy, [See attempted replies to Ingersoll by Chicago ministers.] for the Bible, which serve only, in general, to succor the infidel's efforts against the truth. * * * That your noble effort may be the means of confirming many in the truth, is my humble prayer."

THE BIBLE DEFENDED AND ATHEISM REBUKED.

REPLY

TO

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL'S LECTURES,

"MISTAKES OF MOSES," "SKULLS," ETC.
"WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?" ETC.

BY

ALLAN B. MAGRUDER,

LAYMAN AND BIBLE STUDENT.

SECOND EDITION,

*With Supplement and Strictures on the Ingersoll-Black Discussion;
Shewing the Bible Doctrine of*

17 32 LIFE, DEATH AND IMMORTALITY.

"MAY WE KNOW WHAT THIS NEW DOCTRINE WHEREOF THOU SPEAKEST, IS?
FOR THOU BRINGEST CERTAIN STRANGE THINGS TO OUR EARS; WE WOULD
KNOW THEREFORE WHAT THESE THINGS MEAN."—*Acts xvii, 20.*

CHICAGO:

C. H. JONES, PUBLISHER.

1882.

Copyright Secured.



BL 2727
M35
1882

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the
office of the Librarian of Congress by

ALLAN B. MAGRUDER.

In July of the year of our Lord, 1882.

DEDICATION.

To the obedient Believers of the "Gospel of the Kingdom of God," (Mark i, 14 ; Luke ix, 2-6 ; Rom. xvi, 25, 26,) and to all of good and honest hearts, of every creed and of no creed, who sincerely desire to know the truth as it is in Jesus, and the more excellent way of the faith once delivered to the Saints, and who may have the courage to follow their convictions, although these may lead them to forsake the devious and treacherous paths of human wisdom and authority in religion, this defense of the Bible against the infidel assailant is earnestly inscribed by their friend and ally,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

It is to defend the Bible as the Word of God and an authentic Divine Revelation to man that these pages are written.

I do not attempt to maintain or vindicate the creeds and systems of Catholic or Protestant Christendom. That issue is not now before us.

It is proposed, in this work, to keep a single object in view, which is the truth of God's word and the vindication, as therein declared, of God's ways to man.

It has been well said that a good cause is more apt to be injured by an injudicious defence of it by its friends than by the most violent attack of its enemies. Hence the danger of attempting too much. I prefer to deal with one subject at a time. This precaution is the more necessary in this instance, because the author of the lectures to which I am replying has very adroitly assailed the Bible by attempting to hold it responsible for the real or supposed sins and follies of the people and churches who profess to follow it. Nothing can be more unmanly and unfair. It is an attempt to mix the tares with the wheat, the dross with the gold, and then complacently to point to the debased compound as not the true metal.

The Bible religion has been altogether Divine from

the beginning. From its glimmering light in the Garden of Eden and in the Patriarchal age, through its brighter radiance in the Law and the Prophets, to its present morning-star beams in the "times of the Gentiles," and onward to its full effulgence in the light and meridian glory of the approaching kingdom and reign of Christ on earth as the Sun of Righteousness, the Gospel has been of God, not man ; not human, but Divine. It has never shone with borrowed light. It is self-illuminating. Its watchword is : "Not Rome, but Jerusalem ; not Socrates, but Moses ; not Plato, but Paul ; not Cæsar, but Christ."

St. Paul, one of its inspired teachers, styles himself "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead," and addressing his Galatian brethren he adds : "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." It is so yet. Now a Divine message must be couched in Divine words. Hence the wise admonition : "To the law and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."

To speak thus is to confine us to a "Thus saith the Lord, and thus it is written."

This must prove my apology, if one be necessary, for restricting this reply to an humble but firm and un-

daunted defence of God's Word, which embodies that supreme wisdom and authority to which all Christians bow with profound reverence.

No apology is needed to those who reverence the Bible as the Word of God, for this attempt to defend that Word and to confute the sophistry of one whose life is spent in laborious efforts to impeach and vilify the Divine oracles. Of the entire sympathy of such there is no reason to doubt. Those who have not adopted as yet that Holy Book as the Divine guide of life, but who value the safety and happiness of mankind, we point to the public avowal by Mr. Ingersoll of his "sympathy" with Socialists and Nihilists who would subvert all law and order and convulse the world by wholesale murder and crime. In this connection we refer them to his confession, "*My sympathies cluster around the point of the dagger,*" etc., as collated in the following pages.

Shall we not endeavor to nip, in the bud, such pernicious sentiments, and, by concentrating public opinion, arrest their inculcation in our now peaceful and happy country? Let all who honor marriage and respect the sacred duties and obligations of domestic and social life arouse themselves, and stand up with united front as one man against these betrayers and destroyers of all that we hold dear.

In moral as in physical life it is the first step that costs. Errors and vices are gregarious. They love company, and need mutual support to give them countenance. Communism, Socialism, Nihilism, all

gravitate to a common centre, which is Atheism ; and as that is the sum of all crimes, it is alike our interest, our duty and our only safety as a people to oppose and arrest the beginnings of evil.

STEPHENS CITY, VIRGINIA.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The kindly and earnest welcome with which this little work has been received by the public, and by his Brethren of the Household of Faith, induces the author to publish a second edition.

Within a few months after its issue, the edition of one thousand copies was exhausted, and a further demand has come to us since, which can only be met by an additional supply.

It is gratifying to know that the work has attracted the attention of the reading public and of the press; of scholars and students, both lay and clerical, and of many earnest learners and honest thinkers, and enquirers as well. As the writer makes no claim to reputation in authorship, and as there is no attempt at fine writing in its preparation, it is fair to infer that this demand for another edition is the result of the interest and value of the theme, and is not due to the inconsiderable advocate. This is not surprising, since no subject can surpass in interest and importance to every reflecting mind the great question of our future destiny when the present fleeting life is over—a question which directly involves

the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures as the very corner-stone of our holy religion, where alone we have any certain assurance of future life. Surely if "there is none other name under Heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved, except the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," (Acts iv.), all men must be deeply concerned in the issue joined in such a discussion, and we cannot easily over-estimate its momentous import.

There is another reason which has doubtless conspired with other causes to produce this demand for full discussion of the questions involved. It is the spirit of the age. The present generation of men in our country, and among all English speaking people, is more and more alive to the inestimable value of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of inquiry and discussion in respect to what is true and real on all subjects and sciences which affect our welfare and happiness as sentient, rational and responsible beings. With all thoughtful minds, the sentiment of religious faith and the necessity of its being well-founded form no exception to this well nigh universal uprising of the human soul for more light and better knowledge. Far from having any reason to dread or deprecate this awakened spirit of investigation, this earnest grappling with the profoundest problems and the deepest mysteries of humanity, the enlightened Christian welcomes and even rejoices in it, for he knows that this determined spirit of inquiry, wisely directed and pursued, must lead to good results. To pursue the opposite path—"to let alone that which is quiet,"—is doubtless a sound maxim for a corrupt cause,

yet such is the usual course with "the wise and prudent" of every generation, and verily they have their reward in the apoplectic slumber which precedes dissolution. The faithful servant of the Master has not so learned Christ. He is taught to "prove all things and to hold fast that which is good"—to "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God"—to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," being assured, "if you continue in my word you shall be my disciples indeed, and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," * * *

* * * and "If the Son therefore shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

Every intelligent reader of the Holy Oracles should know that nothing in the sight of their great Author is of more insignificant value than an implicit, unreasoning faith which emasculates our noblest mental faculties and prostrates our whole moral nature at the shrine of a blind credulity.

Recognizing, as every rational man must, that the world we live in must have a Master as well as a Maker, a Ruler as well as a Creator, and that that Maker would assuredly speak to and commune with the man whom he placed at the head of it, and that that communication, to be permanently accessible to the race that lives upon it, must be contained in a book placed in his hands, and which the wisest and most worthy of our race all agree to call the Bible, man is thus supplied with the key to unlock the mysteries of his being and his abode, and to be "no longer faithless but believing."

The reader will find in the Supplement appended a brief review of the Ingersoll-Black discussion, which has appeared in the columns of the *North American Review*. Whilst in warm sympathy with Judge Black, in his bold and earnest contention for the side he defends, and conceding to his answer the unquestioned merit of a clear and able presentation of the subject from the premises he sets forth, the writer is constrained to regret that those premises logically involve the necessity of defending the tenability of the immortal soul and the eternal torment theories as Bible doctrines, which are mere Pagan inventions, interpolated into the orthodox creed, and entirely at war with the teachings of Holy Writ, thus presenting to his adversary the ready means and opportunity of a successful assault on his position, and with seeming detriment to the Sacred Oracles.

It is in deference to what the writer considers a consistent defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, that he has ventured, he hopes without presumption or offense, to offer the friendly strictures which appear in the Supplement.

I make no apology for the freedom and boldness with which I have assailed the crude theories of Pagan Mythology, such as the immortality of the soul, the eternal torment theory, and the kindred popular errors and follies of the orthodox creeds of modern Christendom—now unhappily constituting the cherished faith of what is denominated Evangelical Christianity. The creeds of Christendom are fair subjects of corrective criticism and condemnation, and he is a recreant soldier of the Cross who hesitates to attack and demolish them in the inter-

ests of truth, and in the cause of humanity. But those who honestly accept them, because they are not better informed, and who think that any religion is better than none, are entitled, personally, to all possible respect and courtesy. We distinguish, therefore, between the false and pernicious creeds, and those who are led captive in error by them. Let not the reader suppose that our assaults upon the former are to be resented as if directed against the latter.

The Author ventures to make one request of the reader—that is, that he will suspend his opinion and conclusions as to this work until he has carefully and candidly read it. It is so customary, even with otherwise considerate men, to judge and pronounce sentence prematurely, that this reasonable precaution becomes necessary. The wisest of men says: “He that answereth a matter before he heareth it—it is folly and shame unto him.” Most readers will find the positions advanced and the arguments here adduced so unusual, so much opposed to the lessons they have learned, and the ideas they have imbibed from their infancy, as to be inclined to reject and repel them at once. But a little reflection suffices to teach us that all truth, however firmly established now, was in a small minority and most strongly opposed at first. It had to win its way to popular confidence by hard and persistent effort. We only ask the benefit of the valuable lesson which such a fact teaches.

The greatest foes to truth are prejudice and ignorance. Her best friends are free discussion and honest investigation.

STEPHENS CITY, VIRGINIA.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE.....	5
INTRODUCTORY.....	9
CHAPTER I.	
ALL THINGS ARE OF GOD.....	18
CHAPTER II.	
IF ANY MAN SPEAK, LET HIM SPEAK AS THE ORACLES OF GOD	25
CHAPTER III	
VANITY OF VANITIES.....	28
CHAPTER IV.	
MR. INGERSOLL'S IGNORANCE OF THE BIBLE.....	31
CHAPTER V.	
SALVATION BY FAITH....	41
CHAPTER VI.	
PEN-PORTRAIT OF MR. INGERSOLL.....	52
CHAPTER VII.	
THE BIBLE IN THE LIGHT OF REASON AND REVELATION..	61
CHAPTER VIII.	
THE BIBLE PROVED BY ITS INTERNAL EVIDENCE.....	77

CONTENTS.

xv

CHAPTER IX.

MR. INGERSOLL'S INCONSISTENCIES.....	84
--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER X.

MORALS OF ATHEISM—MR. INGERSOLL AND THE NIHILISTS.	90
--	----

CHAPTER XI.

DESIGN OF GOD IN CREATION.....	95
--------------------------------	----

CHAPTER XII.

THE FUTURE RULER OF THE NATIONS.....	100
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

BIBLE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT	107
ETERNAL PUNISHMENT NOT ETERNAL PAIN.....	107

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY..	120
--	-----

CONCLUSION.

CONTENTS OF SUPPLEMENT.

INGERSOLL-BLACK CONTROVERSY. ITS FUTILITY.....	140
RESURRECTION, NOT INHERENT, IMMORTALITY, ONLY HOPE OF FUTURE LIFE.....	147
POPULAR AND CHURCH ERRORS AS TO LIFE AND DEATH,	150
OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.....	164
PAGANIZATION OF CHRISTIANITY.....	171
MODERN CHRISTIANITY THE PREDICTED AND PREVA- LENT APOSTACY.....	189, 192, 220

THE GOSPEL THE MEANS OF REGAINING OUR LOST LIFE.....	192, 198
EARLY CHURCH CREEDS.....	198, 209
THE LIFE PROBLEM DISCUSSED; BY PROFESSOR <i>Elliot Coues</i> , OF WASHINGTON, OF THE NATIONAL MEDICAL COLLEGE, ETC., IN HIS LECTURE ON " <i>Biogen</i> ".....	201
THE ORIGIN AND USES OF EVIL EXPLAINED.....	222, 231
MR. INGERSOLL'S NEWLY DISCOVERED CREED. HIS CHARGE AGAINST THE BIBLE OF POLYGAMY AND SLAVERY DISPROVED.....	235
EVIL OF MULTIPLYING RELIGIOUS SECTS.....	240
THE PRESENT AGE BEGUN AT JERUSALEM, AND WILL END THERE WHEN THE LORD COMES, (LUKE I. 30-34, AND XXIV. 47. ISAIAH XXIV. 23).....	242
PROCLAMATION OF THE COMING KING.....	246

INTRODUCTORY.

It is perhaps already known to the public that the writer of the following pages accepted, through the public press, Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll's oft-repeated challenge to believers in the religion of Christ to an open discussion and defence of the claims of the Bible to be a Divine revelation to man.

I was led to this step of confronting this bold infidel by a sense of duty and of loyal devotion to the cause of divine truth, with which, in my humble judgment, the happiness and the highest interests of humanity are inseparably connected. I had reason to believe, too, that the freedom and the impunity with which Mr. Ingersoll had been allowed to hurl his libellous shafts against God's word, unchecked by any fear of opposition and contradiction, was daily producing its natural effect, especially on the young and on the ignorant and unthinking multitude, in an acquiescence, if not an admission of the truth of his utterances. I could not discern any reason why this plain duty to the cause of humanity should be declined by a private citizen and a layman and relegated to some one of the clerical class, seeing that the Bible was the common property and the precious legacy bequeathed to all classes alike by our common Father. I confess, too, that the defence of

the Christian citadel thus rudely assaulted, could not be properly declined by one who had thus far through mature life devoted himself as he has found time and opportunity, without money and without price, to disseminating a knowledge of the great truths and precious promises of the Blessed Book. I felt that, as a layman and without any pecuniary or vested interests imperilled, I could with greater freedom from sectarian or party bias, discern the right and maintain the truth of God's Word in its entirety, and not in a half-hearted apology for the holy book with which some have attempted the task. Accordingly, I wrote and caused to be published in the secular and religious newspapers my acceptance of Mr. Ingersoll's challenge to a public, oral debate on the credibility and divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures. This appears from the published cards which I here insert :

[*From the Restitution, Nov. 10, 1880.*]

COLONEL ROBERT INGERSOLL'S LECTURES AGAINST
THE BIBLE.

HIS CHALLENGE ACCEPTED.

The press of the country trumpets forth almost daily some note of the reckless audacity of Colonel Robert Ingersoll, in denouncing the Bible as false ; in which he speaks, it seems, not for himself alone, but as the representative of a large class of Infidels in our country. He boldly assails the truth of the Bible and seeks by public lectures to bring the Holy Book into contempt and to undermine and subvert the faith and hope of the Christian.

One of the leading journals of the day—the *Philadelphia Weekly Times*—in a recent issue gives expression to the current opinion

of a large number as to the proper method of dealing with the daring "blasphemer" in the following terms :

"Twelve of the leading ministers of Chicago preached on Sunday last in answer to Colonel Ingersoll's recent lecture entitled, 'What Shall I do to be Saved?' They thus gave an importance to the blatant unbelief of Ingersoll that he could not have commanded for either himself or his cause, and the eloquent blasphemer will vanquish the eminent ministers all the time on the forum. He will not logically and conclusively refute their doctrine, but he will sway the multitude and put the clergy at a disadvantage. Colonel Ingersoll is not the most formidable antagonist of religion in our midst. He comes with his banner unfurled and with his shocking unbelief to put all thinkers on their guard ; but the subtle infidelity that is now diffused among our intelligent people is the most dangerous foe of Christianity."

Now, there are some, at least, who differ widely from this paper in its opinion and advice that contemptuous silence is the best reply to Colonel Ingersoll's anti-Bible lectures. If Colonel Ingersoll be as this statement asserts, "the eloquent blasphemer who will vanquish the eminent ministers all the time on the forum" and who "will sway the multitude and put the clergy at a disadvantage," surely he is not a mere vain and empty declaimer and fanatic, but is sufficiently "formidable" to be arrested in his pernicious career by an open and manly refutation of his errors and a bold contention for the truth, in opposition to them. May not "the subtle infidelity" now so generally "diffused among our intelligent people," complained of as "the most dangerous foe to Christianity," be due to this supine policy of silent contempt which this editor still recommends? If past indifference and impunity have failed to arrest his career or to check the flood-tide of "subtle infidelity now diffused" throughout the land, is it not timely wisdom to change the tactics and confront the enemy by more effectual weapons? It is, therefore, not easy to see in the facts recited in the *Times* any ground to condemn the "twelve ministers of Chicago" confessing the Christian faith, for attempting to refute

the bold blasphemer and for defending what they may have considered the fortress of their faith. The wonder is that they have not spoken sooner. It is to be regretted, however, that they should have undertaken their work of reply behind the back of their assailant and not in open opposition in his presence, and before the same audience that witnessed his assaults, so that the antidote might have followed the poison. Such would have been a nobler and a wiser valor.

It is certain that our forefathers, in laying the fabric of our government and the foundations of our civil and religious freedom, did not adopt or recommend the timid and serpent-like policy of weak toleration or contemptuous silence in respect to such social Catilines as Colonel Ingersoll. On the contrary, while they forbid the sword of persecution and the fires of martyrdom as a remedy for such disorders, they have distinctly pointed to the weapons of fair argument and free public discussion as the only legitimate and the best means of arresting pernicious errors in political and religious doctrine, and protecting society from the consequences. One of the most eminent of these, Thomas Jefferson, in the act "Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia," of which he was the author, boldly proclaimed that "truth is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate ; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them." Such, too, is, undoubtedly, the teaching of Holy Writ—the Christian's highest authority, for this enjoins the precepts :

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

"Come let us reason together."

"To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

"Prove all things and hold fast that which is good."

"Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world."

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.”

The examples recorded in Scripture are to the same effect. Witness the public contention between David and Goliath of Gath—of Elijah with the prophets of Baal—of Jesus of Nazareth with the scoffing Scribes, Pharisees, and chief priests of Israel—of the apostles with the Jews at Jerusalem—of Paul with the Gentile rulers at Ephesus, and Thessalonica, and with the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers at Athens and before King Agrippa, and even in the palace of the Cæsars at Rome. This same apostle warns us that there should arise “many unruly and vain talkers, deceivers and gainsayers—whose mouths must be stopped . . . teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake.”

Inspired and instructed by such precepts and examples and learning that Mr. Ingersoll boldly challenges all who maintain and publicly teach the divine origin, authenticity, and binding obligation of the Bible—as the revealed will and Word of God—to meet him in fair, public discussion, and to answer and refute his assaults on the credibility of the Book, received among Christians as the Word of God, the undersigned adopts this method of announcing to Mr. Ingersoll that he will and doth hereby accept his challenge to such an oral debate on such terms of fair and equal rights of discussion, and at such time and place, and under such reasonable preliminary arrangements as may be mutually agreed.

It is proper to say that I undertake the task of responding to and repelling Colonel Ingersoll’s assaults on the credibility of the Holy Scriptures in no vain confidence in my own strength or wisdom. Far otherwise. I bow to the truth of the divine lessons, “Man at his best estate is altogether vanity.” “Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?” My reliance to defend the truth of the Bible and to justify the ways of God to man, rests solely in the power of the divine word and in my earnest conviction of the absolute verity and authenticity of that word, which cannot be successfully gainsayed and overthrown by the puny weapons of human invention

however vauntingly or skilfully wielded. The smooth stone of the brook, hurled from little David's sling, was, when directed in its course by the Divine Power, and on that account, more than a match for the uncircumcised Philistine champion "who defied the armies of the living God," though he was of the enormous stature of twelve feet, was clad in a helmet of brass and a coat of mail, with greaves of brass on his legs and a target of the same metal between his shoulders, and the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." It is the same God that Colonel Ingersoll now has the temerity to defy in denying and denouncing "the Record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." In such a conflict a pigmy is more than a match for a giant, seeing that it is God and not man that defends the right and gives the victory.

For the rest, suffice it to say that the undersigned is, like Colonel Ingersoll, a layman, a lawyer and a lecturer on the Bible—that he readily accords to him what is accredited to him by common report, viz. : That he is a gentleman of intelligence and education, and of proper social rank and consideration. Claiming nothing more for himself, the undersigned submits that they will meet, in this earnest but not unfriendly contention for the discovery of the truth, on fair and equal terms.

Learning that Colonel Ingersoll's residence is in Quincy, Illinois, I forward a copy of this paper to him at that address for such answer as he may give, which I shall feel at liberty to make public.

My address is Stephens City, P. O. (near Winchester,) Frederick county, Virginia. Respectfully submitted.

ALLAN B. MAGRUDER,

A servant of God and a Disciple of Christ.

Receiving no reply to this first card, after more than one month's interval I caused to be inserted in the *Post* of Washington City, of date December 19th, 1880,

a second card, which, with the editorial heading, I here insert :

WON'T TOE THE MARK.

PAGAN BOB AVOIDING A CHALLENGE TO A BIBLE DISCUSSION.

THE following, although somewhat lengthy, sufficiently explains itself :

To the Editor of *The Post*.

The interest of the subject and your publication in *The Post* of my readiness to accept Colonel Ingersoll's boastful challenge to a discussion of the claims of the Bible to be the Word of God, leads me to think that you will also lay before your readers the sequel of my endeavor to bring him to a practical test of the sincerity and the validity of his pretensions.

On the 10th of November my card was published in the *Restitution*, of Plymouth, Ind., a weekly journal devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity and the advocacy and defence of "the faith once delivered to the Saints." In this I distinctly expressed my willingness and desire to meet Colonel Ingersoll in debate on the credibility of the Bible.

It is no secret that he has frequently and for years past, publicly stood before his countrymen as the virulent opponent of the Holy Book, which is the corner-stone of the Christian faith, and has boldly called upon all who accept the Bible as a revelation from God, to answer his arguments or to forsake and abandon God's word. His published lectures all show this.

In my original publication, I said that "like Colonel Ingersoll, I am a layman, a lawyer, and a lecturer on the Bible ; that I readily accorded what was claimed for him by common report, viz., That he is a gentleman of intelligence and education, and of proper social rank and consideration, and that, claiming nothing more for myself, I submitted that if we met in the earnest but not unfriendly contention for the discovery of the truth, we should stand on fair and equal terms."

I forwarded by mail the paper containing the original acceptance of his challenge to Colonel Ingersoll's address in Quincy, Ill., marking with a pen the article in question. A few days later and for greater certainty of transmission, I inclosed the card cut from the *Restitution* in a letter, in courteous terms, inviting a reply. Not receiving any response, on the 28th day of November I inclosed by mail another copy of the card, addressed to Colonel Ingersoll at Washington, seeing by the newspapers that he was residing in that city. I took the precaution this time to send a registered letter, and I have before me the post-office evidence of its receipt and delivery to Colonel Ingersoll on the 29th of November, 1880. But to this letter and to its predecessor, up to date, I have received no reply.

From these premises I am authorized to conclude that Colonel Ingersoll does not intend to respond ; that he stands mute, being either unwilling or unable to undertake the modest task of demolishing the Bible. Let us hope that he has wisely concluded to abandon any further defence of his revolting Atheism. Happy will it be for him if Colonel Ingersoll, repenting of his "mistakes" at last, should confess and renounce them. In 1 Corinthians 1 : 19, we read : "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." Where is the wise ? etc.

ALLAN B. MAGRUDER.

STEPHENS CITY, VA., December 16.

We are left to conjecture the reasons of Mr. Ingersoll's silently declining the meeting for discussion he had so often invited, and as this is a free country, and he is a free man, no one can deny to him without question the indulgence of his newly found reticence and reserve. As he continues, however, his persistent and reckless work of hostility to the Bible, and his heedless animosity to all revealed religion, which is displayed

in its latest development by the publication recently of his pamphlet lecture entitled, by a contemptuous travesty of the Bible question (taken from Acts, chapter 16 : 30), "*What must we do to be Saved?*" Mr. Ingersoll must be made to understand that the question has two sides to it, and that notwithstanding his assumed irresponsibility to public opinion for the effect of his shocking atheism, others have also the rights of free speech and fair criticism on his virulent assaults on their faith which they hasten to exercise, appealing to the enlightened reason, the intelligent apprehension, and the moral sense of their countrymen, who will render a fair and honest judgment between them.

CHAPTER I.

“All things are of God.”—*St. Paul.*

WHEN Voltaire said : “If there were no God, it would be necessary to invent one,” he gave utterance to a truism which is abundantly proved by the history and experience of mankind. It finds a recent striking illustration in the voluminous writings, lectures, etc., of Mr. Ingersoll. Atheist as he is, the more he persists in ignoring and banishing God from our world and race the more earnest is the persuasion of all intelligent and thoughtful minds that on that theory the world would be a trackless wilderness, society an arid waste, and man the monarch of a grand, void, vast chaos. The interests and the real happiness of mankind, no less than their ideas and feelings, sympathies and emotions, are so interwoven with this sentiment of religious faith and duty, that they are naturally impelled to the recognition of a Supreme Power, to whom, without any unworthy self-humiliation, they willingly pay the homage of their veneration and worship. This sentiment is faithfully delineated by the Roman Cato :

“If there’s a power above us
And that there is all nature cries aloud
Through all her works,
He must delight in virtue,
And that which he delights in
Must be happy.”

The statesman knows well that no people can be safely governed without this supporting faith in responsibility to a supreme authority, and that no social compact can be made to cohere except by the cement and saving efficacy of a firm religious faith in its members. Hence the invocation of the Divine name in judicial proceedings, oaths of office, etc.

Can we ever forget the lessons taught by the French Revolution of 1793, whose appalling crimes, yet within the memory of living witnesses, are to be traced to the revolting creed of Mr. Ingersoll's brother Atheists that "Death is an eternal sleep, and there is no God but reason?"

In the United States and through Protestant Europe, faith in the Bible and the obligations its teachings impose, constitute this social cement, and it is not, therefore, either necessary or possible to invent "another or a higher power." Is it therefore wonderful that in Bible lands all efforts, ancient or modern, to undermine and overturn the Divine oracles have recoiled upon their authors and abettors? Like curses, they come home to roost and to torment their inventors.

This latest attempt in that direction in Mr. Ingersoll's pamphlet entitled, "What must we do to be Saved?" forms no exception to the rule. It already shares the fate of all its predecessors; nor is it surprising that it should be so. The Bible is so obviously and triumphantly proved to be true, in the eyes of every intelligent examiner of the sacred record, that no one who has weighed the evidence with candor, and is not an

unreasonable or a wicked man, will presume to deny it. Such is its own testimony, as declared in both the Old and the New Testament. In the former, it is written, it is, "the fool who hath said in his heart there is no God," and in the latter, St. Paul prays that he "may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men," adding "*for all men have not faith,*" which is equivalent to declaring that a man without faith is both unreasonable and wicked. Although Mr. Ingersoll may not regard such condemnation as damaging to his cause, seeing that he discards and denies the apostle's authority in the premises, the concurrence of the public judgment among enlightened men in this conclusion, however, invests the charge with a gravity and importance which cannot be eluded or retorted. We shall expect, in the sequel, to fortify this conclusion by the oracles of reason and revelation so as to leave no room to doubt it.

It cannot be expected that we should meet and confute, one by one, the very many mistakes of fact and errors of reasoning into which Mr. Ingersoll has fallen, nor is it necessary.

His pre-judgment of what, as an honest examiner, he ought to have subjected to proof, is indicated by the self-invented motto he has prefixed to his latest work. In it he has brought forward the new charge of interpolations in the Bible text. He says: "Interpolations are the foundation stones of every orthodox church." Now we know this is untrue, although, as already said, that statement, if true, does not affect the integrity of the Bible record, and might pass unchallenged in our

defence of it, yet as he repeats, specifically, the charge of interpolations of the text of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, it is well here to note,

I. That he never charges such adulterations except when he is confronted with some text which stands inconveniently in the way of his own preconceived theory; and

II. That he never troubles himself to give any other authority for so grave a charge than his bare assertion. He boldly reckons on the enormous credulity of his readers or on their unlimited confidence in his infallibility, in lieu of the high and imposing authority which every other scholar and critic feels bound to avouch in support of a charge so grave. Let one example of his method of procedure suffice. In his bitter denial and denunciation of Mark 16 : 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned" (p. 39), he says, "I propose to prove to you that this is an interpolation;" and his proof consists in the simple assertion that as neither Matthew nor Luke nor John record the words, which Mark alone preserves, they *must* be interpolated. To give some color to this conjecture he writes: "In the first place, not one word is said about belief in Matthew. In the next place not *one word* about belief in Mark until we come to that verse" . . . and "Luke gives an account of the same last conversation and not one word does he say upon that subject," and "I turn to the first chapter of the Acts, and find an account of the last conversation, and in that conversation there is not one word on this

subject," and then he audaciously concludes, in triumph, "*This is a demonstration* that the passage in Mark is an interpolation!"

Is our author accustomed to rest his "demonstrations" at the bar on such reasoning as this? Would he presume, as a historian collating the written testimony of four witnesses, to reject every fact which was not attested, *totidem verbis*, by each and all? He is a lawyer, and should know that the most authentic testimony of several witnesses to the same transaction embodies "substantial truth under circumstantial variety,"* and that the failure of one or more witnesses to see or hear or report every or any given incident of the scene which may be preserved or recorded by another with equal or better opportunities to know, is never accepted as a ground of exclusion of the latter's statement, for the simple reason that there is no necessary conflict between them. It is merely negative, is easily accounted for, and is never permitted to impeach the positive testimony of the fuller narrative, for both may be true. Besides, it should be remembered that these four historical narratives, usually called gospels, were not written at the same time or upon consultation. We see from Luke's preliminary statement to his friend Theophilus—not objected to as an interpolation—that "many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word,"

* Starkie on Evidence.

etc.—that there had been certain written narratives previous to Luke's history.

The chronology of the four narratives shows the same fact, for we know that John was the survivor and last writer of them all. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that in the preparation of their histories respectively, each should be desirous and even careful to avoid reciting and repeating what his predecessors had already written, and should prefer to preserve and record some other of the wonderful deeds and words of Him who spake as never man spake.

There was no scarcity of material for these fuller and varied records of the acts and sayings of the great Teacher ; for John tells us in his narrative that “ Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book,” etc. It is thus we are to account for the variation of the matter of Luke and John, the latest biographers, from those of their predecessors, Matthew and Mark. John's Gospel, we know, is very notably different from all the others, preserving more of the words and discourses of our Lord than any of them. These obvious considerations sufficiently account for the omissions referred to, and afford to every fair mind the strongest proof of the unaffected honesty of the several historians, for had their histories exhibited a close correspondence and conformity as to particular statements, which would be natural with the work of impostors, there would have been ground to suspect and charge collusion and fraud.

But is Mr. Ingersoll aware that, in imputing fraudulent interpolations on the ground that all the Evangelists do not chronicle every notable saying or deed of their Master, he wields a two-edged sword and stands on dangerous ground? If the objectionable text referred to (Mark 16:16) is to be discarded for the reason stated, as an interpolation and apocryphal, does not the Sermon on the Mount share the same fate? It is Matthew alone who chronicles this sermon in full, which Mr. Ingersoll indorses and approves so warmly, saying: "All the miracles, including the resurrection and ascension, are, when compared with portions of the Sermon on the Mount, but dust and ashes," and: "For the Man Christ I have infinite respect. . . . To that great and serene man I gladly pay the tribute of my admiration and my tears;" yet by the inexorable logic of his reasoning he is bound to expunge this sermon, thus warmly eulogized, and cast all its wisdom and virtue, along with so much of his creed as he takes from it, into the waste basket of discarded interpolations! "Verily," saith the proverb, "the legs of the lame are not equal."

Although avowing himself an Atheist, and consequently without any religion (unless there can be religion without any God), he offers as a summary of what we must accept as his creed in this last lecture, what he calls the "grand religion of humanity;" and when we come to inspect the items of this creed we see that all that is good in it is taken from the Bible, and all that he declaims against as bad is not found there. Strange

to say, it is largely made up of passages taken from the Sermon on the Mount, supplemented by what he calls "the gospel of good fellowship, good friends, good living [which he explains to mean good cooking], good clothes, good houses and the gospel of soap and water" (pp. 82-85).

In view of such vain trifling, such solemn mockery on such a subject, it is difficult to resist the charitable conclusion that its author has lost his head, has become the unhappy victim of monomania and is not responsible for his actions, and therefore we are tempted to turn away from the task we undertake, in pity rather than reproach.

But we give Mr. Ingersoll, like every other culprit at the bar of justice, the benefit of the doubt as to his mental condition, and proceed, for the sake of others, to repel his assaults.

CHAPTER II.

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."—*St. Peter*.

MR. INGERSOLL'S *brochure* entitled, "What must we do to be Saved?" consists of eighty-nine pages; it is verified as the only correct edition by his signature, bears the imprint Washington, D.C., 1880, and embraces ten chapters. Of these four are devoted to the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; five relate by name to the Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the

Presbyterians, and the Evangelical Alliance respectively, and the final chapter to "What do you propose?"

With that part of his work which relates to the churches the writer does not undertake to deal, for the reason that it is the vindication of the Holy Scriptures against their assailant that he undertakes in this reply, and not the defence of any sectarian creeds or church formularies that Mr. Ingersoll has thought proper to attack. As to them, we say with the Roman satirist: *Non nostrum tantas componere lites*.^{*} And although it is through these churches and their real or supposed faults and errors that the infidel strikes at Christianity, that hostility does not affect the real issue between us, which is, the truth of the Bible, whether his criticisms on the churches be well or ill founded.

If he succeed in proving, as he asserts (p. 56), that "in Spain the Catholic Church stands erect and is arrogant; in the United States that church crawls, but the object in both countries is the same, and that is the destruction of intellectual liberty;" that "the Episcopal Church was founded by Henry the Eighth, now in heaven, who cast off Queen Catherine and Catholicism together and accepted Episcopalianism and Anne Boleyn at the same time" (page 62); that "The Methodists, founded by Wesley and Whitfield, teach the frightful doctrine that everybody is going to hell, and that a Niagara of souls is constantly pouring over an eternal precipice of ignorance," etc. (page 66); that the "Presbyterian Church was founded by a murderer, John

^{*} It is not for us to compose this strife.

Calvin, who first inaugurated human torture," etc. (page 77) ; and that " the Evangelical Alliance, made up of all orthodox denominations of the world, are believers in the infamous doctrine of the utter depravity of human nature and look upon a little child as a lump of depravity" (page 78), if, I repeat, he could prove all or any of these assertions it might indeed afford a reason for his rejection of these churches, but surely would fall far short of proving the Bible to be false. There are few, if any, who believe that all churches are right in creed and practice, and we know it is quite possible they may be all wrong, but there stands the Gospel of Christ founded not on human creeds but on the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever ; and he is a poor reasoner who holds it responsible for the mistakes and follies, the vagaries and inconsistencies, of creeds and churches, though they may choose to take his name to represent their doctrine.

It is the weak device of a shallow reasoner to characterize a creed or practice opprobriously, and then to assume that his opponent undertakes the championship of the obnoxious tenet, and proceed to disprove and demolish it. Such it would seem is Mr. Ingersoll's method of dealing with the Bible. He concludes that when he has refuted the church creeds, as he fondly believes he has, he has overthrown the Bible also, which he assumes to be identical with them. Let him try the Bible doctrine on its own merit. Let him " Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And when he undertakes

to quote Bible testimony to sustain the charges to which he supposes it is fairly liable, let him observe the reasonable rule to "rightly divide the word of truth," and not utterly commingle and confound, as he does, the law with the Gospel, the Jews with the Gentiles, Moses and the prophets, the oracles and expounders of the Jewish polity and ritual with Christ and the apostles, the ministers and missionaries of a broader system, intended, not for one people and nation on one narrow territory, but for every nation and all the world.

Until he learns these simple rules of logical propriety and fair construction, he is disabled and disqualified for the task he has undertaken, and becomes of necessity a trumpet of uncertain sound. This we shall expect to show abundantly in the sequel.

CHAPTER III.

"Vanity of vanities," saith the Preacher. "Vanity of vanities—all is vanity."—*Ecclesiastes*.

WHATEVER virtues and accomplishments Mr. Ingersoll may possess, it is certain that modesty is not one of them. This does not surprise any one, however, who reads his voluminous lectures against the Bible, and will be more conspicuous when we survey the self-imposed task of Mr. Ingersoll in his latest work before us, whose design is to overthrow the Bible and destroy the structure of Christian faith and hope which rests upon it. It is difficult to suppress the amazement with which

one is filled when comparing the task he undertakes, with the means he employs for its accomplishment. All the usual similes to denote the impossibility of achieving such an end by such means fall short of their mission and prove impotent and unmeaning in this instance. To storm the fortress of Gibraltar with a pocket pistol, to put out the light of the sun by the glare of a farthing rush-light, to dam up the ocean with the palm of the hand, though familiar, are feeble figures to express the vanity and folly of the audacious attempt of Mr. Ingersoll, however earnest and sincere, to batter down the work and the word of Omnipotence.

Here is the light of the Gospel of Christ, which, even before its full development, has by its benign radiance reclaimed nations and peoples innumerable from the chains of heathenish ignorance and darkness, lifted them from the depths of the most stupid and debasing superstitions, and, in its advancing and resistless march, has in a large degree suppressed and vanquished the childish, though chronic paganism, idolatry, and degradation of past ages, and introduced instead the numberless ameliorations, improvements, and refinements of civilized life; a system which in spite of the combined opposition of priest-craft, infidel philosophy, and science, falsely so called, and while yet in the incipency of its wonderful growth and progress, has illuminated the world with its effulgent glory and is at this day recognized, appreciated, and admired, as the perfection of Divine Wisdom, by the noblest and most enlightened of our race, and as the only hope and re-

fuge of our fallen humanity. And now, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years of the world's steady growth in human knowledge, science, literature, and art, under the fostering influence of this new and divine light, one rises up in the person of Mr. Ingersoll, and offers to lead us back into barbarism, to relegate our world and race to the darkness and disorder of primeval chaos, into a world "without form and void." Such is his Gospel of Atheism !

Now, I am far from maintaining that men who dissent from the majority should not be heard. That would be to decry free inquiry and free speech, rights which Christianity and the laws of the land alike bestow upon all, and which are invaluable ; but let us remember that He who said : " He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," said also to his disciples : " Take heed how and what you hear." Consequently, when one like our author undertakes to change and abolish the creed and customs of a whole people, and to uproot the well-considered convictions of the better part of mankind, on the ground that the Bible is false, he cannot expect and does not deserve to be favorably heard unless he shall be able at once and in the beginning, to present such reasonable and obvious grounds for his conclusions as shall fairly and of necessity compel the respect and attention of thoughtful and honest men. When, instead of presenting such manifest and considerate facts and arguments, we are treated to stale misstatements, to obvious mistakes, to ignorant and perverted interpretations and to unsupported assertions and charges of interpolation

into the text of the Bible, not to mention other assumptions and self-refuting arguments which abound in his works, it is not surprising that our courteous patience should at length yield to a prudent husbandry of our time, and force a withdrawal from further profitless attendance on his Lectures. He who really has nothing to offer us worth hearing has no right to object to our retiring from his audience, and seeking elsewhere the wisdom and light which he cannot supply.

CHAPTER IV.

MR. INGERSOLL'S IGNORANCE OF THE BIBLE—SOME OF HIS MISTAKES EXPOSED.

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."—*Romans* 1 : 22.

OTHERS have undertaken the task of pointing out the mistakes of Mr. Ingersoll, which particularly abound in his lecture entitled "Mistakes of Moses." It would, therefore, be a work of supererogation to make any detailed correction of these, but it seems proper to show that Mr. Ingersoll's ignorance of the contents of the book he attempts to speak and write down, must necessarily disqualify him for the task he undertakes. Surely no man is competent to present us with a trustworthy commentary or confutation of a book he has not examined and studied with at least a fair share of candor and diligence. If Mr. Ingersoll be a fair and impartial critic, it is certain that a thoughtful and

thorough investigation of the subject would have brought him to the conclusion directly opposite to that which he seems to have embraced. Such has been the result of nearly every honest inquiry into the evidence which Christians rely upon to sustain the credibility of the sacred Scriptures.

Lord Lyttleton, the elder, and Gilbert West, were in their early manhood members of an infidel club in London and were intimate friends. From early association and from reading the works of infidel "philosophers" they incautiously imbibed their sentiments, and held the Bible to be a huge myth or a plagiarism from Oriental superstitions; and they conceived, like Mr. Ingersoll, the benevolent idea of emancipating the public mind of their countrymen from a delusion, in their judgment, so deplorable and injurious. Upon conference as to the best method of effecting their object, each selected what he considered the most vulnerable part of the New Testament. Lord Lyttleton undertook to write a work to expose the fraud and falsehood of the conversion of St. Paul, and Mr. West agreed, by a similar method of attack, to disprove the Bible account of the resurrection of Christ. Like honorable and intelligent men, each set himself diligently to work to examine the facts and the testimony upon which these miracles were supposed to rest. They carefully pursued their task for months, and it was apparent to each of them on their frequent conferences as to their progress, that their approach to the foregone conclusions they had already adopted was not satisfactory. At length

each surprised the other by the confession that they had undertaken impossible tasks, being led by the testimony to the unlooked-for conclusion, that what they had resolved to overthrow as false was in reality true. Such was the natural and reasonable result of an intelligent and honest investigation of the evidence. Like honest and truthful men, they resolved to write in defence of the truth of the stupendous miracles they had set out to disprove. Accordingly our modern English literature scarcely affords two abler treatises, very masterpieces of their kind, than Lyttleton's "Conversion of Paul," and West's "Demonstration of the Resurrection of Christ." If Mr. Ingersoll will follow their example of diligently reading the book he assails, he may profit by their experience.

On the cover of one of Mr. Ingersoll's publications we read : " These lectures have created the greatest sensation in the religious world since the days of Voltaire. Hundreds of pamphlets have been published, thousands of sermons have been preached, and numberless articles have been written against them, with the effect of increasing their popularity every day." Such is the statement copied from the inside cover of his latest work, on which cover we find his authorization of the publication. If not written by himself, it doubtless expresses his approval of the statement. Admitting its correctness it affords proof, not of Mr. Ingersoll's cleverness, nor of the merit of his cause, but argues only an extraordinary ignorance of the subject, and especially of the Bible, " in the religious world," which we can scarcely

credit, for his lectures certainly present an incredible mass of misstatement, assumption, fallacious reasoning, and a Bible illiteracy which a very limited acquaintance with the Scriptures should enable "the religious world" easily to detect and expose.

What seems to be the most formal and elaborate of our author's lectures is entitled "Some Mistakes of Moses." Although it contains two hundred and seventy-eight pages, it is easily answerable in the smallest duodecimo edition of a primer which would simply *call for the proof*, while it would take a folio to record the "*many* mistakes of Ingersoll." But the game is scarcely worth the candle; a specimen brick or two from his tottering temple will suffice.

In his "Mistakes of Moses," pp. 100-113, he says:

1. "Moses begins by telling us that God made the universe out of nothing," p. 100.

No such statement is found in the Bible.

2. That Moses "relates that the gods came down and made love to the daughters of men."

There is no such statement.

3. That "the children of men built a tower to reach unto the heavens and climb into the abode of the gods."

Moses does not say so.

4. That "the grass began to grow and the flowers to blossom without a solitary ray of light."

Moses does not say so; on the contrary, Moses tells us the first creation of God was *light*.

5. That "God allowed Adam and Eve to live six hundred and sixty-nine years, without knowing their A B C."

The Bible says, Gen. 5 : 5, " And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died," and is silent as to their A B C.

6. That " the ark came down on Mount Ararat, a peak seventeen thousand feet above the level of the sea."

The Bible says, Genesis 8 : 7, " And the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat"—a district of country according to ancient geography. How can Mr. Ingersoll specify which of the mountains of Ararat, or how high? If I say, " I live in the mountains of Virginia," does that prove that I live on the Peaks of Otter?

7. That the children of Israel sojourned in Egypt 215 years.

The Bible says, Exodus 12 : 40, " Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." Accurate Mr. Ingersoll !

8. That the manna, though it would melt in the sun, they used to cook by seething and baking.

Does not Mr. Ingersoll know that manna was of the nature of honey or sugar, and is he ignorant of the fact that though either will melt in the sun, yet by cooking each can become hard and solid, as in rock-candy, confections, etc.?

9. That " by reading the second chapter (of Genesis), you will find that God tried to palm off on Adam a beast as his helpmeet !"

There is absolutely no excuse whatever for such an atrocious and infamous statement. It is a gratuitous invention, as any reader may see by reading the chapter.

10. That "God believed in, taught, and upheld polygamy."

This is another invention of his own coinage. On the contrary, God created a single pair the parents of the human race, showing by this example, as well as by precept, the true law of marriage. This law is expressly affirmed and attested by "that great and serene man" to whom even Mr. Ingersoll "gladly pays the tribute of his admiration and his tears." In Matthew xix. it is written: "The Pharisees also came unto Jesus, tempting him and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that He which made them *at the beginning*, made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to *his wife*, and they *twain* shall be one flesh . . . And they said unto him: 'Why did Moses then command to give her a writing of divorcement and to put her away? He said unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.'"

11. That "God commanded the Israelites to overrun Canaan and kill every man, woman, and child for defending their native land."

The Bible makes no such assertion. On the contrary, the reason for expelling the Canaanites, etc., is expressly declared in Leviticus 18:24-30, and Deuteronomy 18:9-13: "For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord, and because of these abom-

inations the Lord God doth drive them out from before thee."

"Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me into possession of this land, but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee." (Deut. 9 : 4.)

12. He says "There is not one word about woman in the Old Testament except the word of shame and humiliation" (p. 111).

Of all the reckless and audacious statements of Mr. Ingersoll in his insane war on the Bible this one takes precedence. It is difficult to believe that a man of ordinary prudence and intelligence would venture to make that assertion in the face of the familiar knowledge of his countrymen to the contrary. That this charge is wholly untrue is easily proved by an appeal to the Divine Record. The Bible history of woman and the record of many of them by name, shames into silence the nefarious accusation. He will scarcely persist in his libellous assault if he will read in the Bible the praiseworthy and honorable testimony as to Sarah, Rebecca, Miriam, Deborah, Jael, Ruth, Naomi, Hannah, the Shunamite, Abigail, Huldah, Esther and others. Several of these were the female ancestors of the Messiah. What token of shame and humiliation attaches to any one of them, and where is his authority for the charge that the Bible speaks of them in such terms? Nor is this all. Has he never read in the

Scriptures such passages as these : “ A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband.” “ The woman is the glory of the man.” “ Her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her. She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of kindness. Her children arise up and call her blessed, her husband also and he praiseth her. Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised,” etc.

If Mr. Ingersoll be sincere in making this statement, he enjoys probably the rare distinction of being the only man of intelligence and education in the land who does *not* know, as one of the recognized factors and features of the civilization of our age, that wherever the Bible is most read and believed, there the sincere respect, the moral elevation, and the lofty appreciation in which woman is held is most willingly conceded, and her just rights and her social happiness and safety are most jealously guarded and protected. Does Mr. Ingersoll forget the crusaders and the age of chivalry, whose motto was, “ *God and my Lady*” ? Does Mr. Ingersoll ignore the fact, or does he suppose us to forget, that in Christendom alone, of all the religious divisions of the world, the most numerous of the present ecclesiastical sects which acknowledge the Bible, the Roman Catholics, erect churches and altars, and are even charged with paying Divine honors to a Jewish woman, the Virgin Mary ? Would he have us forget that at the present moment the sovereign who rules the widest dominion, and the

most populous empire on earth is a woman, in the person of Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India? Let him answer and tell us frankly as a man, how woman stands, and what is her social rank and condition, in all countries without exception, where the Bible is *not* known, and where his allies in atheism, superstition, and savagery hold sway. Let us ask him to contrast the condition of woman in these lands, deprived of the light of the Bible, and in our own, enlightened by the blessed book. A recent report of travels in Africa by Commander Cameron, presents us conveniently with the means of that contrast.

The following, from a recent English paper, gives the account :

“The funeral of an African chief is thus described by the traveler, Commander Cameron, as taking place in Urua, in the centre of the Dark Continent. “The first proceeding is to divert the course of a stream, and in its bed to dig an enormous pit, the bottom of which is then *covered with living women!* At one end a woman is placed on her hands and knees, and upon her back the dead chief, covered with beads and other treasures, is seated, being supported on either side by one of his wives, while his second wife sits at his feet. The earth is then shovelled in on them, and *all the women are buried alive*, with the exception of the second wife. To her, custom is more merciful than to her companions, and grants *the privilege of being killed* before the huge grave is filled in. This being completed, a number of male slaves, sometimes forty or fifty, are slaughtered, and their blood poured over the grave, after which the river is allowed to resume its course.”

Let Mr. Ingersoll look on this picture and let him say if he will still advise us to extinguish the light of the

Bible, with all its humanizing influences and all its heavenly sanctions, and adopt the *suttee* of the African or the self-immolation of the Indian—to fall before the car of Juggernaut, or bow in adoration before the crocodile of the Ganges. He cannot evade the force of this appeal by insisting that education, knowledge, learning, etc., will convert and reclaim these barbarians. That experiment has been tried in Greece and Rome in former times, and has failed deplorably; for history testifies that in these States it was in the very culmination of philosophy, the arts, and what was called polite learning that public virtue was unknown, that venality and corruption, superstition, and licentiousness were universally prevalent; and in modern times we have seen in infidel France the unnatural union of the highest intellectual culture and literary accomplishment with the most frightful personal vices and the most cruel and revolting public crimes, the legitimate and inevitable result of dethroning the Bible and groping in the darkness and desolation of atheism. The highest achievement of human wisdom and learning cannot dispel the darkness which envelopes the knowledge of the origin, the constitution, the nature, the relations, and obligations and the destiny of our race and world. Such knowledge calls for a revelation, and comes from God only. Hence the very first mandate of the Creator in respect to our earth was “Let there be light.” That light has been concentrated in the Bible for man’s use and safety, for in it we read: “The entrance of thy Word giveth light.” Where that light shines, there is know-

ledge, wisdom, progress, power, and salvation. In its absence, there is darkness, desolation, destruction, death.

“ Thus men go wrong with most ingenious skill
 Bend the straight rule to their own crooked will,
 And with a clear and shining light supplied,
 First put it out, then need it for a guide.”

In view of this exposure of a few only of the many “ mistakes ” (to use no stronger term) with which Mr. Ingersoll’s book abounds, I ask the candid reader what confidence can be placed in one who, through ignorance or design, would mislead and betray him into the fatal pit-falls into which he has plunged himself? Surely a word to the wise is sufficient.

CHAPTER V.

SALVATION BY FAITH.

“ Without faith it is impossible to please God ; for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.”—*Hebrews*, ch. xi.

THAT God should speak to man whom He had created and placed on the earth ; that He should prescribe laws for his government, first by oral command, and in process of time, as the race increased in number and in intelligence, by written statutes ; that these laws should be adapted to the infancy, the manhood, and the maturity of the race of man, and according to his light and knowledge and capacity to understand and obey, and

which should consist in few and simple precepts in the beginning, and be amplified and enlarged in proportion to his expanded intelligence ; that these should be for man's good and to secure to him and his posterity, by obedience, prosperity and blessedness from the hand of his gracious Creator ; that He should require him to believe in his Benefactor's will and power to protect and bless him, are all propositions so reasonable as to be obvious to the plainest capacity. It has been reserved to Mr. Ingersoll and his infidel compeers to deny them, to reject and rebel against them, one and all.

In his latest printed lecture* he has selected the proposition of salvation by faith as taught in Mark, sixteenth chapter, sixteenth verse, as one which particularly shocks his high sense of justice and the fitness of things. Against it he hurls his most fiery indignation. He says (p. 39) : " It is the most infamous passage in the Bible." He calls it " a frightful declaration" (pp. 43, 44), saying, " I deny it. It is infamous ; Christ never said it." This is his *bête noir*, the special foe he has set himself to battle with and destroy. His cry is : " How preposterous to make a man's salvation depend on his belief."

Now we ask is not man's every step in life a verification of this truth ? Does not the infant child take his first step in physical life by faith ? Is it not because he believes what the parent tells and shows him, that he can walk if he will try, that he makes the attempt and succeeds ? We summon Mr. Ingersoll to the stand as a witness. If he had not believed that a certain road would

* " What must we do to be Saved ?"

lead him to Washington city from his home in the West, and therefore had taken and pursued that route, would he have reached his destination ?

Will he walk over a bridge unless he *believes* it to be safe ? Will he ascend a stairway or stand upon a ladder unless he believes it to be strong ? But why reason further with a man who, without seeming to know it, contradicts himself at every step he takes. On page 39 he says that the passage in Mark 16 : 16, which teaches "salvation by faith," is "the most infamous passage in the Bible ; Christ never said it, no sensible man ever said it." "It is a frightful declaration." Yet on pp. 82-87, he gives us *his* creed as well as his gospel in answer to his question : "What must we do *to be saved?*" He says, "I believe in good fellowship, good friends, etc." "I believe in the gospel of cheerfulness, in the gospel of good living, in the gospel of intelligence, of education, of liberty, of forgiveness to each other, in the grand religion of humanity," and adds, "*That is what I believe in!*" All this from a man who indignantly denounces *salvation by faith!* as illogical, absurd, and even frightful. A man, as we have seen in the instances cited, who takes not a step in mental, moral, or physical life, except by faith as the motive power ! Verily such a man writes his own epitaph and follows as chief mourner at the funeral of his own reputation.

Every action is the result of belief. In his "gospel" of salvation he tells us he will have a man saved by "actions," "deeds." Does he not see that these spring from belief and volition, and that an action which

did not spring from these would be the act of an automaton? It is the spring of the action in which all its character for good or evil lies. From his own "summary" he believes in just such actions as the Gospel of Christ demands—"humanity, mercy, justice, good fellowship," etc. He preaches that those who practise such things thereby procure safety and happiness. To quote his words, that "upon the man who does right the cross turns to wings that will bear him up *forever*" (p. 86). Is he not thereby proclaiming that whosoever believes shall be saved? And as he says "whosoever murders, assassinates his own joy; who steals, robs himself," does he not thereby announce the corresponding proposition that whosoever believeth not in "goodness, in justice, in truth," etc., shall be damned. So that Mr. Ingersoll's own experience and confessions concur with the Bible declaration, that "we walk by faith and not by sight."

Let us endeavor now to remove Mr. Ingersoll's benevolent apprehensions as to the fate of him who, sinning against light and knowledge, refuses to believe. It is certain he is at fault in his understanding of the world *damned*, and the obnoxious text used to express the fate of the unbeliever. We know its Latin derivation, *Damno*, I condemn; and turning to a competent authority, Webster's Dictionary, we read the following definitions of the English word "*damned*, viz.: *condemned*, hateful, detestable." Is it not, then, very illiberal and illogical in Mr. Ingersoll to complain that the Bible teaches a doctrine which he is thus proved to in-

dorse, and which is indeed so satisfactory to him as to be almost identical with that which he proposes in answer to his question, "What must we do to be Saved?" Thus, it seems it is not of the Bible's plain declaration in Mark 16 : 16, that he has any right to complain, but of the different interpretations put upon the term used. If understood in the primary, which is the dictionary sense, *damned* is simply "condemned," while the theological sense (which neither reason nor revelation requires us to adopt), ranges through a great variety of meanings, some of which represent to him the most awful pictures that the imagination can paint. These last have evidently "vexed his righteous soul" with indignation, and frightened Mr. Ingersoll from his propriety. In the lecture "What shall we do to be saved," Mr. Ingersoll has planted his whole argument on the assertion that neither Matthew, Mark, nor Luke, had said one word about salvation by faith, and, therefore, as they were with our Lord daily, He never could have taught any such doctrine. Now this affirmation is utterly unfounded, as may be seen from the great number of citations given below, which show that our Lord based both physical and spiritual salvation upon faith.

Matthew 6 : 30 : "Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of *little faith*?" Matt. 9 : 28 : "Believe ye that I am able to do this? They say unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to *your faith* be it unto you." Ibid. 22 : 5. "Daughter, be of good

comfort ; *thy faith* hath made thee whole.” Ibid. 18 : 6 : “ Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which *believe in me*,” etc. Ibid. 21 : 32 : “ But the publicans, etc., *believed* him.” Ibid. 23 : 23 : “ Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and *faith*. These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.” Ibid. 21 : 21 : “ If ye have *faith*, and *doubt not*, . . . ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, and it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, *believing*, ye shall receive.” Ibid. 8 : 13 : “ And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way ; and as thou hast *believed*, so be it done unto thee.”

Mark 1 : 15 : “ The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand : repent ye, and *believe the Gospel*.” Ibid. 4 : 40 : “ And he said unto them, Why are ye so fearful ? how is it that ye have *no faith* ?” Ibid. 9 : 42 : “ Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that *believe in me*, it is better for him that . . . he were cast into the sea.” Ibid. 5 : 36 : “ As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, *only believe*.” Ibid. 11 : 22 : “ And Jesus answering said unto them, Have *faith* in God.” Ibid. 9 : 23 : “ Jesus said unto him, If thou canst *believe*, *all things are possible to him that believeth*.” Ibid. 11 : 24 : “ What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, *believe* that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.”

Luke 1 : 45 : “ Blessed is she that *believed* : for there shall be a performance of those things that were promised her from the Lord.” Ibid. 8 : 12 : “ Those by the way side are they that hear ; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out their hearts, lest they should *believe and be saved*.” Ibid. 5 : 20 : “ When he saw their *faith*, he said unto him, Man, *thy sins are forgiven thee*.” Ibid. 17 : 5, 6 : “ And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our *faith*. And the Lord said, If ye had *faith* as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the roots, and be thou planted in the sea ; and it should obey you.”

The mission of those three Evangelists was to give us in a condensed form, the history of the life, doctrine, miracles, and deeds of Jesus, to show that He was the prophet, priest, and king appointed for the salvation of our race from the dominion of sin and death, of whom Moses and the Prophets wrote ; in short that Jesus was the Christ or Messiah promised from the beginning. They accomplished this mission by showing from the prophetic testimony who the Christ was to be, and by historic testimony who Jesus was, and thus they identified the one with the other. Another of these biographers, John, supports this statement of their work, for he says, “ these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that *believing* ye might have life through his name.” Thus Mr. Ingersoll may see how they harmonize and reconcile the Old and New Testaments in exhibiting

Him to whom even Mr. Ingersoll is ready to pay the tribute of his "admiration and his tears."

When those were sent out after the day of Pentecost, when they were endowed with power from on high, to preach the Gospel and call upon the people to believe, they could point with confidence to Him in whom they were to believe, as one of whom Moses in the law and the Prophets did write; and upon the testimony of these living witnesses concerning Jesus, as that Christ or Messiah, they laid the foundation of the Church of Christ. Thus the people were required to believe something definite and tangible, namely, the Messiahship of Jesus, through whom the ultimate redemption of our race and world was to be accomplished.

So far as to the special mission of the Evangelists, during the life of our Lord. Now as to the moral conduct of those who received Him and their personal preparation for the salvation He offered them through the Gospel. As they were required to aim at perfection, they had to be furnished with a model of the highest excellence. They supplied them with that model, and afterwards pointed them to it for imitation. As to Mr. Ingersoll's charge that Matthew, Mark, and Luke do not require belief as a condition of salvation, if it were true we might see a reason for their omission to do so then, because the model was not yet finished. A master who makes a model for his pupils, does not call on them to copy as he models. He waits until it is finished, and then says "come and copy." So when Jesus bowed his head on the cross, and said "it is finished," the model

was complete. His sufferings and labors ceased, and, after the resurrection, their work as apostles and witnesses began. The book of Acts, the record of their labors, and the sum of their testimony, naturally embodies their teaching of salvation by faith.

To believe in the Christ embraces a great deal. It implies first, of course, understanding Him. It is a great elevation to any mind to comprehend and appreciate a superior being ; one is exalted by the very process ; especially when we admire and confide in such an one with the feelings and affections of the heart. Even when we say in respect to a man, " I believe in him," it is understood that we would trust our dearest interests in his hands, implicitly. If he should tell me, who am ignorant of the right way, this path will lead you to destruction and that to success and safety, would I not trust him and follow his instructions? Thus I would prove my faith in him and would be walking by faith. Is not all this comprehended in believing? and is it wonderful that it secures salvation?

If Mr. Ingersoll will look into the history of the times in which our Saviour came into the world, he will see that the people needed some such model of purity to believe in and to imitate. He will probably put confidence in the words of one who, like himself, has avowed his open hostility to religion in a book styled " The History of a Conflict between Religion and Science." Its author, Dr. Draper, says of the Greeks, the most highly cultivated people of pagan antiquity (who, to use Mr. Ingersoll's words, " had more books on their shelves,

more pictures on their walls," and all else that Mr. Ingersoll considers the *summum bonum*), that they were at that time sunk in vice and licentiousness. He gives also the following graphic description of the Romans, at the period of Christ's coming. He says, "When the Empire in a military and political sense had reached its culmination, in a religious and social aspect it had attained its height of immorality. It had become thoroughly Epicurean. Its maxim was that life should be made a feast, that virtue is only the seasoning of pleasure, and temperance the means of prolonging it. There was a social splendor, but it was the phosphorescent corruption of the ancient Mediterranean world." Does not Mr. Ingersoll recognize the family resemblance between this picture and that which he draws of the highest good to man, the condition to which his "Gospel of Humanity" would reduce us from the elevation to which Christ's Gospel would lift us? Of the latter, even Dr. Draper admits that, "for many years Christianity manifested itself as a system enjoining three things—toward God, veneration; in personal life, purity; in social life, benevolence." He further says of the Christians of that day, quoting approvingly from Tertullian: "The objects of their life are innocence, justice, patience, temperance, and chastity." Of what use, it may here be asked, would be the life of Christ, of what value its beautiful delineation by the Evangelists, if it had not moved men to action, to a new life? We have shown its motive power for that purpose to be faith, belief. Does Mr. Ingersoll expect the plant with-

out the seed, the effect without the cause? He no doubt thinks that the exalted ideas of benevolence, humanity, etc., which he commends in his "Gospel of Humanity," are the spontaneous offshoots of his own heart; but as we find these teachings in the Evangelists, long before he discovered them, they may be safely traced to Christ's Gospel, the result, doubtless, of the Christian influences with which he has been surrounded in our native land, and without which his perceptions would have been as obtuse and demoralizing as those of Pagan Greece and Rome.

As to what he says about the various churches, we may reply, as their creeds, by his own admission, have not made all the people as wicked as his premises led him to suppose, he should logically conclude that the Bible, or so much of its teachings as the people get from the Sunday-schools and the pulpit ministrations of the day, form such wholesome food for our moral nature that though presented, as he argues, on so faulty a platform as the church creed, it ought nevertheless to be accredited as good and profitable to that extent.

A distinguished Protestant minister* has said: "There are more objectionable and dangerous tenets in many Protestant churches than in the Catholic Church, but the difference is, the Roman Catholics have nothing but the tenets, while in the Protestant churches the tenets are a dead letter, and the people in general have the living Word of God in their hands as a guide to the Divine life and light."

* The late Dr. Channing.

CHAPTER VI.

PEN-PORTRAIT OF MR. INGERSOLL—PHYSICAL, MENTAL,
MORAL, CHIEFLY AS PHOTOGRAPHED BY HIMSELF.

"Beholding his natural face in a glass and straightway forgetting what manner of man he was."—*St. James.*

MR. INGERSOLL'S lectures, as authenticated by his signature, contain on the cover an advertisement of the sale of his photographs and busts, of various sizes and prices, in which he is styled "The Great Apostle of Liberty," and in which those who condemn his lectures are denounced as "haters of progress, despisers of reason, cringers, crawlers, and hypocrites." Yet he strongly protests against those "who try to answer arguments with personal abuse."

The writer of these strictures does not intend to transcend legitimate criticism in presenting a sketch, chiefly autographic, of one who thus seeks to make his appearance and physical characteristics as well as mental lineaments familiar to the public. He presents himself as, in some sense, an exhibit in his own cause. This is all matter of taste, as to which men differ. Those who set themselves up as models cannot expect to escape criticism. He who aspires to the *rôle* of reformer of creeds and conduct among men, to be a rectifier of wrongs, must show his sincerity by example as well as precept. He must,

"Point to fairer worlds on high,
And lead the way."

If Mr. Ingersoll demurs to this course, let him remember that those who live in glass houses must not throw stones.

How does this new Cato, the Censor, fill this mission? We shall see.

The *physique* and the features of Mr. Ingersoll, even as revealed by the photograph, give us a picture of his prevailing characteristics. His lymphatic temperament, his heavy jaw, his thick lips, his capacious mouth, his sensuous eyes, his short, broad neck, and the prominent fulness of all the animal developments, attest the predominance of the masculine, the muscular, and the emotional, over the reasoning faculties and the moral sentiments. If his mental impressions are quick as a flash, they are quite as fleeting. Intent on the flame and the fire of his weapon, he seldom stops to see if the shot strikes. Consequently he repeats his fire, but still misses the mark. He propounds his conclusions in advance, and batters his sword to pieces against the rocky rampart that stands in his way. He skims the surface, he never goes to the bottom of things. He deals with superficialities, not with solids. He declaims, he does not discuss. He asserts, he does not prove. He does not reason, but he rants. He never deliberates: he dogmatizes. He does not investigate; he invents. His imagination has been cultivated at the expense of his reasoning faculties. The propensities and emotions predominate. They keep in abeyance the moral sentiments. Such men are superficial philosophers, who take up or oppose a position without consideration, as a

man tosses off a glass of beer without being thirsty. They do not think, weigh, or measure. They accept what they find to be in harmony with their governing impulses and propensities, and are borne along without resistance on the tide of the passions and emotions. All logical inquiry, all searching analysis, all study of the causes, and reasons, and end of things, is irksome to them. If they ever heard, they do not heed the pithy truth, "*Who most investigate do most believe.*" They walk by feeling, not by faith, and are impelled only by what they see and hear. Now, not then; the present gratification, not to-morrow's reward, forms the motive power of their actions. Destitute of faith, they do not believe that it can take hold of any future good. They deny that it is either "the substance of things hoped for or the evidence (conviction) of things unseen." To believe demands some thought, some investigation. Disbelief, or rather unbelief, is simpler and easy. Hence all such men are atheists; it is their only creed, or no creed.

We are not surprised to find in Mr. Ingersoll one whose estimate of the moral education of children and of the value of truthfulness, is so low as to make him write thus in his lecture on "Skulls," (p. 123): "Suppose your child tells a lie. Don't pretend that the whole world is going into bankruptcy. Don't pretend that that is the first lie ever told. Tell him, like an honest man, that you have told hundreds of lies yourself, and tell the dear little darling that it is not the best way, that it soils the soul." . . . "Think of a great big

man coming to a little bit of a child with a club in his hand. What is the little darling to do? *Lie*, of course. I think that Mother Nature put that ingenuity into the mind of the child when attacked by a parent, to throw up a little breast-work in the shape of a lie to defend itself. . . . Suppose a man as much larger than we are, as we are larger than a child five years of age, should come at us with a liberty pole in his hand and in tones of thunder want to know 'Who broke that plate?' There is not one of us, not excepting myself, that wouldn't swear that we never had seen that plate in our lives, or that it was cracked when we got it."

In the same lecture he says in effect, that truth is not worth suffering for, that one had better lie than suffer pain or lose a drop of blood. "He would turn Judas Iscariot to his own soul" to save a thumb!

Are we surprised to read the legion of fabrications we find in the lectures of such a man? In his latest published lecture he says (pp. 31-32): "It is far more important to love your wife than to love God, and I will tell you why. You cannot help Him, but you can help her." . . . "It is far more important that you love your children than that you love Jesus Christ." He proclaims his utter insensibility to any motive power in life stronger than supreme selfishness. Was not Mr. Ingersoll an officer in the late Civil War? Did he not there win his title of Colonel? What induced him to enter the army? If he had loved his home or family more than his country or the cause that was imperilled in the war, why did he not remain at home and

hire a substitute? Will he deny that his duty to his country was paramount to the claims of home and family? He is too flaming a patriot not to admit this : then he loves something more, in other words, he recognizes higher duties and responsibilities in some cases than those that belong to wife, children, and friends. With what consistency, then, can he condemn Christians for loving God supremely?—our Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor, who offers also to be our Saviour, Redeemer, and Ruler ; in whom we “ live, move and have our being.” He certainly possesses the supremest claims on our faith, our obedience, and our love. Yet Mr. Ingersoll proudly, even scornfully, rejects his service.

The man who drifts along without question or care on the flowing tide of life, without using the rudder and compass with which his barque is supplied, must at length be carried out to sea and find when too late that his frail boat is ill able to ride the stormy waves he encounters. No wonder that, after a fitful struggle, he sinks beneath the overwhelming waters. In respect to such disasters, we are prone to say that such a man is the victim of circumstances ; but candor compels the confession that the circumstances are generally subject to his own control, and his fate is but the natural result of his actions, or of his failure to act. The rudder and compass, which in Mr. Ingersoll’s programme are his “ brains,” are furnished him that he may direct his voyage in safety. Though informed of this, he will not use them. Is it wonderful that he reaps the fruit of his own folly? Is

not the mischief he sustains self-inflicted? It is a case of *felo de se*. Now Mr. Ingersoll is this adventurous voyager, and he has himself furnished us with the key to the cause of his irreverence and infidelity in the circumstances and the surroundings of his life, which enable us, if he will give heed to our counsel, to rescue him from the shipwreck which threatens him. He tells us in his "Mistakes of Moses," that he is trying "to save his hearers from a belief in eternal fire." Here is a fragment of his autobiography, taken from another of his lectures :*

"When I was a boy there was one day, in each week, too good for a child to be happy in. In those good old times, Sunday commenced when the sun went down on Saturday night and closed when the sun went down on Sunday night. During this interval a gloom deeper than midnight fell upon the house. You could not crack hickory-nuts then. If you were caught chewing gum it was only another evidence of the total depravity of the human heart. Well, after a while we got to bed, sadly and sorrowfully, after having heard Heaven thanked that we were not all in hell. . . . Why I was not burned to a crisp was a mystery to me. The next morning we got up and we got ready for church, all solemn, and when we got there the minister was up in the pulpit about twenty feet high, and he commenced at Genesis about the Fall of Man, and he went on to about twenty-thirdly. . . . Well, when he got through that, then came the catechism, the chief end of man; then my turn came, and we sat along on a little bench, where our feet came within about fifteen inches of the floor and the dear old minister used to ask us :

"Boys, do you know that you ought to be in hell?"

* Lecture on "Skulls and Replies," republished from the Chicago *Times*.

"We answered up, as cheerfully as could be expected under the circumstances :

" ' Yes, sir.' "

" ' Well, boys, do you know that you'd go to hell if you died in your sins ?' and we answered :

" ' Yes, sir.' "

"Then came the great test, when the old man, the dear old minister, used to try and show us how long we would be in hell if we would only locate there. The grand test question was :

" ' If it was God's will that you should go to hell, would you be willing to go ?' "

"And every little liar said :

" ' Yes, sir.' "

"Then in order to tell how long we would stay there, he used to say :

" ' Suppose once in a billion ages a bird should come from a far distant clime and carry off in its bill one little grain of sand, the time would finally come when the last grain of sand would be carried away. Do you understand ?' "

" ' Yes, sir.' "

" ' Boys, by that time it would not be sun-up in hell.' "

"Think of it ! think of it ! *and that is the Christian religion!*"

From the diagnosis of Mr. Ingersoll's mental and moral characteristics already presented, we are not surprised that in view of this fearful picture of his early religious training, and with his unreasoning, but strong emotional nature, he should be frightened from his propriety, and that its impress should remain on his mind in after years, for nothing can be more revolting, and, I am happy to add, nothing *more contradictory to the Bible*, than this creed and catechism that the "dear old minister" used to make him recite.

If Mr. Ingersoll had as solid foundation for his unreasonable and unreasoning atheism as he has for his rejection of the doctrine of the endless torment of any of God's creatures, he would need no apology at our hands, but he is entirely at fault in his illogical conclusion, "*and that is the Christian religion !*" If he had spent a tithe of the time and labor he has employed in his anti-Bible lectures in a fair investigation, by the light of God's word, of this inhuman dogma of Pagan invention, the scales would have fallen from his eyes and he would have escaped the patent absurdity and short-sighted folly of rejecting the Bible for teaching a doctrine which it utterly discountenances and repudiates, and which is at war with its oft-repeated and most solemn utterances. This announcement may take Mr. Ingersoll by surprise, but it should not. He ought to have prepared himself by a diligent collation of the Divine testimony to support his damaging charge against a book which nowhere teaches the dogma against which Mr. Ingersoll rebels, but, on the contrary, testifies of its author that God "will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever," because he delighteth in "mercy"—that "He deals with man as a father with his children, and that like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him, for he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust"—that He "desires not the death (far less the eternal torment) of the sinner, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live"—that "God is love, and that we love God be-

cause he first loved us," and that finally He has so wisely and benevolently arranged the closing drama of humanity that "the tabernacle of God shall be with men and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people and God himself shall be with them, and be their God; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes;" that there shall be in the grand final scene, "no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be *any more pain*, for the former things are passed away, and every curse shall be removed."

Can the emotional Mr. Ingersoll find in his feelings, or his judgment, any reason to complain of such a Being as this? This is the God of the Bible, in whose parental and merciful hands is the destiny of our race, who "will render to every man according to his deeds," and while he will not spare the guilty, he will graciously reward the righteous above their deserts, and will punish the wicked less than they deserve (Ezra 9:13; Psalm 103:10), and who assures us that "the judge of all the earth will do right."

Let Mr. Ingersoll understand, therefore, that there is not a single text in the Bible that, fairly interpreted, affords the least countenance to the revolting doctrine he discards. It is quite true, and pity 'tis 'tis true, that some "orthodox and Evangelical churches" have, some by sufferance and some knowingly, permitted the introduction of this unscriptural dogma, borrowed from the Pagan mythology, into their creeds and confessions; but again the writer protests to Mr. Ingersoll and to all his congeners that the Bible is not to be held responsible for it.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BIBLE PROVED TO BE TRUE BY REASON AND REVELATION.

“Come, let us reason together.”—“He that is of God heareth God’s words.”—*The Bible*.

MR. INGERSOLL, like all his compeers in infidelity, believes and teaches that reason, not faith, is the true guide and guardian of our life. We have seen how scornfully he rejects the proposition of salvation by faith. He boasts of the “holy torch of reason” in his possession, and protests that “God will never damn men for following that sacred light.”

Now, accepting, as we do, the Bible meaning of “*damned*,” already defined to be “condemned, judged,” etc., let it be understood that, as to the latter clause of his proposition, for once, at least, we heartily agree. He is greatly mistaken if he suppose any intelligent Christian to deny that reason is the ally and handmaid of faith. Let us briefly survey their mission in the work of human salvation. They merit our attentive examination, for both are gifts of God, and they offer us respectively their testimony in proof of revelation. These oracles will never be found to oppose or contradict each other. Faith may indeed require our assent to truths which are above the reach of reason; but never contradictory to its sound teachings.

Mr. Ingersoll subscribes to the pernicious sentiment that reason and religion are irreconcilable, that where

reason begins religion ends, and *vice versa* ; which, in effect, affirms that religion is an unreasonable system. On the contrary the Christian maintains, that as God is the author of both, and doth not contradict himself, all true religion will be found in harmony with true science and with right reason. With him the proper use and end of reason is to inspect the credentials of revelation, and, being satisfied of its authenticity, to lead us to the Bible, and, not forsaking us there, reverently to accompany us, with this faithful guide as the pilot, in the search and discovery of truth.

I invoke in this argument the exercise of reason first, for it is written, "Come, let us reason together." The path of duty is said to be a "reasonable service." St. Paul reasoned before Felix of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." He *reasoned* out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, etc. (Acts. 17 : 18).

What, then, is the rational argument before us?

I. We have this book, the Bible. Whence did it come? The infidel says the priest made it. We ask, Who made the priest? Again the answer comes, "fear, superstition ;" and then we ask, "Who made fear? Mr. Ingersoll's last book opens with the words: "The whole world has been filled with fear." "Fear is the dungeon of the mind, and superstition the dagger with which hypocrisy assassinates the soul." But he stands mute when pressed to tell where fear comes from. He knows the answer will disclose some *First Cause*, and that first cause reason calls God.

II. Reason teaches us that the Bible is either the

work of God or of man, and as there are but two classes of responsible men, good and bad, if of human invention, the book must be fabricated by one or the other. Reason argues that it cannot be the work of bad men, for they would have no motive to forge a book which on its every page condemns themselves, and sets its authority flatly against their character and deeds ; and if it had been the work of good men they would justly claim its paternity and boast themselves in its wisdom. But the testimony of these last, through whom it was delivered to mankind, disclaims their paternity and unanimously testifies, "*Thus saith the Lord,*" and being good men they must be truthful witnesses ; and hence again reason decides it is the work and the word of God and not of man.

III. Reason, taught by human experience, discovers to us that as the conception or idea of God which is found in all men, however degraded by ignorance and vice, is not innate, but is traced to tradition, that conception is not inherent, but is communicated to man by an external agent. The American Indians, like all savage tribes, have been found in possession of the idea of a Great Spirit, of a common Father and Creator, but they invariably testify that they derived it from their fathers. It is handed down by tradition from father to son ; and thus when we ascend to the first man of the race, it must needs be that the Creator revealed himself to the creature, which accords with the Bible narrative by Moses, and of which no other book can inform us.

IV. Reason, instructed by human experience, proves

to us that language—human speech—is a Divine arrangement. It is not natural to man but an imitated art. All men learn to speak. They are taught by their parents or others their language. Who taught the teachers? Their parents. And thus we reach the first parent and the first speaker, in Adam; and the Bible alone gives us the information, in Genesis 2:16, 20, that the Lord God talked with Adam in the Garden of Eden, and even tested his infant faculty of speech by causing him to give names to the animals. This conclusion is verified, too, by the fact, universally known, that one born deaf is necessarily dumb also, cannot speak because he cannot hear the human voice, and consequently cannot imitate its sound in vocal speech.

V. Reason and experience again concur in their testimony that their own existence and value to man arise from their relations to an external power. Without our five senses, sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch, man could not exercise, even if he could be said to possess, his reason. This external informing power is God in his works and his word, which last narrates the creation, use, and value of these organs.

VI. Reason deposes, that without the Bible both the birth and death of our race are unnecessary, meaningless, and mysterious; for without a future life, which no one will deny the Bible offers us, there can be neither a reasonable cause nor an intelligible design for our creation and death, and seeing that our death is, as reason and observation depose with the Bible testimony (Gen. 3:19), the “returning unto the ground out of

which man was taken," reason reaches the conclusion that a reconstruction or resurrection of the dead man from the grave is the only method of restoring him to life, and thus supports and necessitates the resurrection, which is exclusively and peculiarly the Bible doctrine of future life and to be found in no other book.

VII. There is yet another external proof of the truth of the Bible, which the friends of the Bible have a right to claim. It is that the most worthy, virtuous, and intelligent of our race, the most thoughtful, considerate, and upright men of every country in Christendom, have, after diligent investigation of the credentials of the book, reached the conviction that the Bible is true and worthy of all confidence. Such a conclusion is so clearly sustained by the testimony of reason, observation, and experience, that we cannot hesitate on reason's evidence to record a verdict to that effect.

Perhaps the most striking illustration of this almost universal credence of the Bible is found in the confession of the whole civilized world of the truth of the Bible narrative of the birth and Lordship of Christ declared in their recognition of the new Christian era, and their invariable use of the date Anno Domini, 1881, etc. The general use of oaths and attestations on the faith of the Bible and in the name of God in all formal and solemn public and private acts and occasions, in the several departments of the government, in all legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings, coupled with the distinct and oft-repeated assertion and recognition of our Lord Jesus Christ as the founder of the age in

which we live, should estop or render harmless any denial of the facts on which the Bible religion reposes. Nor is this evidence merely inferential. It goes further, and becomes prescriptive and positive ; for by the laws of the land and in judicial and parliamentary proceedings no witness or officer is permitted to be heard or to act who does not avow his belief in God and in a state of rewards and punishments. To these considerations we add that not in these acts alone but in our publicly recorded declarations in those solemn public documents which form, in part, our history as a people in these United States, we have formally and fully committed ourselves, willingly and gratefully, to the belief in God and the Lordship and supernatural excellence of his Son our Saviour.

In the American Declaration of Independence, our first and most imposing act as a free and independent people, our fathers solemnly “ appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions,” and asserted “ the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature’s God entitled them ;” they declared they were “ endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,” and they closed the celebrated paper by expressing their “ firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.”

One of the earliest amendments to the Constitution of the United States forbade the enactment of any “ law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” thus recognizing our religious nature and providing for our perfect freedom in its exercise.

The organic laws of the several States contain similar enactments. In the commonwealth of Virginia, the Convention which formed the constitution "invoke the favor and guidance of Almighty God," and asserted in the Bill of Rights that "religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction * * * and that it is the mutual duty of all to practise Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other."

We are not surprised, therefore, to find the most eminent jurists of our country interpreting the rights and responsibilities of all American citizens in the light of these enactments. Chancellor Kent, commenting on these provisions says (volume 1, p. 657) : "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, may be considered as one of the absolute rights of individuals recognized in our American constitutions and secured to them by law."

In the celebrated case of *Vidal et al vs. Girard's executors* (2 Howard 127), Judge Story, delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, declared that "Christianity is part of the common law of Pennsylvania," and of all the States of the Union. Mr. Webster's argument in the same case, sustained by the conclusion of the court, is well-known to lawyers and statesmen, but cannot be cited here in detail for want of room. A further illustration of the same fact is supplied by the common law and statutory offences of profanity and blasphemy, and of laws to prevent, under penalties, the

desecration of the first day of the week, set apart to commemorate the resurrection of Christ.

VIII. I group together certain notable external and visible witnesses to the truth of the Bible, which, in reason's eye, offer incontestible evidence. These are known and read of all men. The heavenly bodies, with their extraordinary yet exact revolutions ; the wonderful regularity and unbroken succession of the seasons of seed-time and harvest, of day and night ; the relations of husband and wife ; the phenomenon of the rainbow ; the attesting explorations, researches, and discoveries in archæology in Bible lands, affording confirmatory historical proof of facts stated in the Bible ; the newly discovered attesting construction and admeasurements of the great pyramid of Egypt, now identified by satisfactory proofs with "the pillar for a sign and a witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the land of Egypt," in Isaiah 19 : 19, 20, all testify in reason's ear that God is, and prove the Bible to be true.

IX. The Jews, as a people in history and prophecy, are living witnesses for the Bible. They can, with confidence, be placed on the witness-stand, for they are the most conclusive and the best-known attestors of the Bible in all history.

It is known that Frederick the Great was prone to assemble at his court the most learned scholars, philosophers, and theologians of Europe. It is related that one day, with his accustomed *brusqueness*, he accosted one of his chaplains, saying, "Give me without argument, in a word, the strongest proof you can present of

the truth of the Bible." The answer was promptly returned, "The Jew, sire, the Jew. It is impossible to account for his history and his presence among us on any other hypothesis than the literal and absolute truth of the Bible."

The reply could not have been more apposite.

If we cast away our Bible, as Mr. Ingersoll would have us to do, if we seal up the pages of that oldest and most venerable history of our race and world, what an unaccountable anomaly, what an insoluble mystery, what an unnatural social interpolation is *the Jew*? Here they are among and yet not of us. Pioneers of our race and among the first proprietors of the earth we inhabit, once at the zenith of human prosperity and renown, now exiles, fugitives, and Arabs among the nations—without a home or a country, without a temple or an altar or a victim; without prophet, priest, or king; without rule, cities, or institutions; without lands and flocks and herds. Yet once, in the days of David and Solomon, their land and temple and capital city were their boast and pride as the glory of all lands, and themselves the people of God, so richly blessed that the fame of their greatness spread to distant lands, whose monarchs came from the uttermost parts of the earth to behold their wisdom and glory, and confessed that the half had not been told them. Now the same people are exiled from that once fair and fruitful, but now deserted and desolate land, and have become a byword and a hissing reproach among the Gentiles, who are descendants of nations whom their ancestors looked down upon in scorn

and contempt. They remain among us to this day witnesses among all mankind and, to the confusion and reproach of all infidels, a standing monument and miracle of the truth of the Bible. Let Mr. Ingersoll open the book he has rashly covered with reproaches, and read in Moses and the prophets, as in Deuteronomy, chapter 28, the predictions relating to the children of Israel, and then note their exact and literal fulfilment now present before his eyes. He will read all the details in this chapter, and a brief summary in these words of Hosea, a prophecy delivered nearly eight hundred years before Christ: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince and without a sacrifice, and without an image and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." Is he not a witness to the first part of this prophecy? The testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John will exhibit to him, in outline, the same prophecies in the words of that "great and serene man to whom he gladly pays the tribute of his admiration and his tears." He will read, speaking of his countrymen the Jews, these words of the Lord, "They shall fall by the edge of the sword and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," concluding with his touching and most affecting lamentation over them and their beautiful city in ruins: "Oh!

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not ! Behold your house is left unto you desolate, for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till you shall say : Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Nor is even this all our proof. There are patent physical facts in regard to this ancient people which are known to all men and cannot be denied, and which, being so peculiar and phenomenal, prove to a demonstration the direct impress of the hand of the Almighty and carry us back to the Bible for the only explanation to be found. Of these is their continued unbroken practice of the rite of circumcision, from its original institution down to the present day. This has always kept them distinct from every other people and race ; and that most wonderful though indescribable mark in the face and countenance which causes their descent and lineage from Abraham to be easily, even instantly, recognized. We meet the Jews everywhere. They are scattered among all nations, and yet are not reckoned with or among any. They preserve their distinct isolation and their own peculiar habits and customs in the midst of the peoples among whom they may be said to sojourn rather than to live. What the gulf-stream is to the seas, "a river in the ocean"—what the burning bush of their own Sinai is to other mountains, scorched and blasted, but not consumed, so are they to the nations

and countries to which they migrate. They do not adopt our habits or avocations. They do not build, or buy or deal in real estate. They do not cultivate the land, nor sow, nor plant, nor reap. These pursuits would identify them with the soil and give them a permanent footing in the earth, which they do not desire and will not accept. On the contrary, they deal in money and bills of exchange, in merchandize and clothing, in buying and selling, in bargaining and brokerage ; all their wealth and their possessions are portable or easily convertible into coin or bills, so that they may be ready at a moment's warning, to move on and change their abode to some other region, or to return to Palestine, the home of their race.

Not their customs and business habits alone make them a peculiar people, but their visage, their physiognomy, is unique, and unlike any other race or people. We meet them in the cities or on the crowded thoroughfares of business, and as soon as our eye rests upon them, we say, without hesitation or risk of mistake, "There's a Jew"—there is a son of Abraham, a wanderer and an exile far from the home of his fathers. Arabs in the desert of the people, they are the oldest of existing nations, and you cannot help asking where are now their conquerors and persecutors ; the Pharaohs of the Egyptian bondage, the Assyrians, the Medes and the Persians, the Greeks, the Macedonians, the Romans, and the Saracens ? And the answer comes back, "They have been swept down the tide of time, and are utterly lost in the ocean of oblivion." Yet here is the pro-

scribed, wandering Jew, who, in spite of cruel and unrelenting persecutions, and contrary to all the calculations of human probabilities, remains the survivor of them all, and now the only inheritor of the fame and glory of the most renowned and illustrious race that ever lived. And if you ask the meaning of all this, is it not the Bible and the Bible alone that gives the answer, that solves and explains the mystery? Opening the venerable record, you find there the revelation of the secret, for you will read that far back in the beginning, "when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. 32); that "the people of Israel shall dwell alone, and not be reckoned among the nations" (Numbers 23 : 9); and that after their long dispersion, "shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord, their God, etc., in the latter days" (Hosea 3); that "Behold the days come, saith the Lord . . . when I will bring again the captivity of my people, Israel . . . and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God" (Amos, chap. 9).

The long banishment and exile of this ancient race, and the waste and desolation of their native land to this day, are not more clearly proved by prophecy and history, than their return and gathering together again is predicted by their prophets. The intelligent Christian not only recognizes the exact and literal fulfilment of the prophecies of their return to Palestine, but he

hails it with grateful joy, because he knows that it is their Messiah who is his Saviour and deliverer. He does not forget that "Salvation is of the Jews," that "in him shall the Gentiles trust," that "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," and in brief that all the promises "are yea and amen in Christ Jesus." Accordingly we are not surprised to see on the broad theatre of international affairs, in the movements among the nations of the earth, the daily growing evidence of the rising prominence and importance of the Jews and their affairs in respect to their historic country, their restoration to their ancient home, and the reconstruction of their long-lost nationality. Within the memory of living men their long continued and unjust civil disabilities have been almost everywhere removed, and they have risen to the platform of political and legal equality with their former Gentile oppressors. These are only preparatory steps to future developments. Even the very recent and significant fact that in the German empire, where they are most numerous, as well as in Hungary and Bavaria, in Austria and Russia, they seem to have become obnoxious to the native populations through envy and jealousy of their extraordinary wealth and prosperity; which goes to show that this persecution is but another feature of the divine programme, and will necessarily quicken their predicted exode from the nations among whom they are scattered, to Palestine their future home, from which, as the prophets say, they will "remove no more."

As Joseph in Egypt, Mordecai in Persia, and Daniel in Babylon, rose to the highest rank and dignity at the courts of their former Gentile oppressors in the ancient world just previous to their emancipation from oppression and exile, so now their countrymen are filling the highest places and positions in Gentile governments. The Rothschilds, the late Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield), Sir Moses Montefiore, and other Jews in England ; Grévy, Gambetta, and others in France ; Gortschakoff and Todleben in Russia, and others in Germany, Italy, and Austria, distinguished as statesmen, diplomatists, historians, professors, bankers, orators, composers, and actors, are witnesses in this generation of the long promised but now approaching deliverance and restoration of this pre-historic people to their ancient inheritance.

Doubtless Mr. Ingersoll is either ignorant or faithless of this purpose of God in regard to his ancient people, the children of Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God. In attempting in one of his lectures to set aside the prophecy of future events of a kindred nature, he quotes with avidity this saying of the Master : " Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled," by which he supposes that such prophecies as we have cited have either failed altogether or relate to past events. There are two conclusive answers to such an objection.

I. That the word translated *generation* is the Greek γενεα, genea, the primary and most obvious meaning of which in Donnegan's Greek Lexicon is " race," " fam-

ily," and it is used in other places in that sense, notably in Psalm 95 : 10, in the passage : " Forty years long was I grieved with this *generation*," etc., referring to the apostacy of the Jewish *race* in the wilderness,—an interpretation or translation of the word *genea*, which the English student will naturally accept, seeing that it is from this root, *genea*, we derive our word *genealogy*, the science of races. We read in Matt. 1, " The book of the *generation*," *i.e.*, lineage, " of Jesus Christ."

II. That the context shows the error of the translation " generation," for the associated events in the prophecy were, many of them, necessarily in the distant future and some are yet unfulfilled, and could not refer to the generation contemporary with our Lord. See Luke 21 : 24-27 : " They shall be led away captive among all nations. Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. . . . And they shall see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory," events which we know have not yet been " all fulfilled."

It is their Messiah who says of them : " Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled ; and when these things begin to come to pass then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." And Isaiah, their own prophet, in prophetic anticipation of these unfulfilled promises, breaks forth in the sublime strains of poetic inspiration : " Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts

shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously."

In view of such incontestible proofs furnished by prophecy and history, and to some of which Mr. Ingersoll is witness, showing the literal verification of the truths of the Bible, may we not pause and ask if he can remain the scornful disbeliever he has been heretofore? If he possess the noble qualities of truthfulness, honor, and manliness which he claims for himself, if he be not of that unhappy class who, "having eyes see not, and having ears hear not," let him, like one of old who had been permitted also to contend with the Almighty, lay his hand upon his mouth and his face in the dust and confess like him: "Behold I am vile. I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes."

We shall see whether he is made of the "sterner stuff" that, in deep penitence, brought the patriarch Job to the feet of his Maker.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BIBLE PROVED BY ITS INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

"The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation by faith which is in Christ Jesus."—*Paul to Timothy.*

"He that built all things is God."—*Paul to the Hebrews.*

HAVING reached the conclusion from the undeniable premises submitted in the last chapter that our reason accepts the credentials and authenticates the truth of

revelation, we proceed to cite the proof afforded by the Bible itself, the internal evidence, and to examine the contents of the holy volume as forming the rule and guide of our life, and acquainting us with a knowledge of the destiny of our race and world.

There are few things in which the Divine wisdom is more conspicuous than in the great age attained by the patriarchs. At that early prehistoric period men were dependent chiefly on the personal testimony of eye-witnesses of the Divine manifestations, or, what was of the next value, on the accounts of those who had received the facts with as little of second-hand statement as possible. When we remember that the flood occurred 1656 years after creation, and that Adam lived 930 of these years, and that Noah was 600 years old when the deluge occurred, there remains only a gap of 126 years between Adam and Noah, and as Noah's father, Lamech, was 182 years old when Noah was born, he lived with Adam 56 years, and was contemporary with Noah 595 years, dying but five years before the flood. Noah had thus the advantage of this long intercourse with one who had lived 56 years with Adam, the father of mankind. Thus Noah had a knowledge of man's history from one, himself but one degree removed from the first man.

The generations after the flood were but little less favored when we remember that the birth of Abraham was 1996 years before Christ, and taking that sum from 4004, the age of the world at that time, it was but 2008 years from creation ; and if we take the epoch of the

flood from the era of creation, that is, 1656 from 2008, we have from the flood to the birth of Abraham, 352 years. But as Noah lived 350 years after the flood it appears he lived to within two years of Abraham's birth, and Noah's son, Shem (probably the Bible Melchisedec), who lived 502 years after the flood, was the contemporary and companion of Abraham for 150 years, the difference of time between Abraham's birth and Shem's death. This gives us only four witnesses from creation to Abraham, to wit, Adam, Lamech, Noah, and Shem.

The interval from Abraham to Moses is bridged over by the long lives of Isaac (180 years), Jacob (147), Joseph (110) and their successors in Egypt to Moses. Meantime the Israelites preserved their isolation as a distinct race by circumcision, and jealously guarded their traditional history, refusing to be incorporated with their Egyptian-task-masters, thereby escaping the danger of losing their identity and the memory of their traditions.

To Moses revelations were dictated by Jehovah personally, and by him they were recorded in written language and supernaturally preserved in the ark of the covenant, and by the Levites up to the building of the temple, and in that sanctuary afterward, and to their conquest and captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and during that captivity and exile, by the prophets Daniel, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and by Ezra and Nehemiah, for, on their restoration and the rebuilding of the temple, we find the two last in possession of

the sacred oracles, and reading them publicly in the audience of the people.

Their safe custody in the second temple continued unto Christ, for we learn that the law, the prophets, and the Psalms, from which our Lord quoted (Luke 24 : 27-44 and elsewhere), were all in the possession of the Jews up to that period, and have remained with them to this day. The authenticity of these chronicles of the Jews as a people is further established by the references to them in the New Testament, in which the genealogy of Christ is traced by Matthew up to Abraham, and by Luke to Adam. It is impossible to suppose, humanly speaking, that his lineage could have been thus traced without these Jewish records, which were accepted as genuine and indisputable.

As to the books of the New Testament, the whole Eastern world, especially the literature and learning of Greece and Rome, presented unusual facilities for multiplying copies of such remarkable books, in many languages, and for their preservation and circulation. This seems to preclude the possibility of their loss or essential mutilation. It should be added also, that by a special Providence of God, the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues, in which the Holy Scriptures were written, became, not long after the death of Christ, by reason of the overthrow and dispersion of the Jewish people and the early downfall of the Roman Empire, dead languages, and were no longer subject to those changes in the use and meaning of words which a living language always undergoes. Thus the Divine revelations became

stereotyped, if we may use the expression, and so remained, to the discovery of the art of printing, which being "the art preservative of all arts," multiplies and secures to the million, at this day, the cheap and well-nigh universal diffusion of the blessed book, heaven's best gift to man.

With this review of the testimony, both human and Divine, does not Mr. Ingersoll, and every intelligent and honest man, perceive that every hypothesis impeaching the truth of the Bible and resting on a supposed defect of the testimony showing its transmission to us, is based on false premises and falls to the ground?

Opening the Bible, we read in the first verse of the first chapter of the first book of the sacred record, as follows: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" and turning to the last part of the last book of the same volume, we read: "Behold I create a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away."

Was ever book placed in man's hands with suppremer claims to his interest, his admiration and his gratitude; opening with the announcement of the creation of one world, and closing with the promise of another!

From this great primal truth taught in Genesis 1:1, we deduce by simple logic the following imposing conclusions:

I. That the Bible contains within itself in prophecy and history, the record of the past, present, and future of our race and world. It acquaints us with the origin

and history of one world, and foretells the creation of another, with its characteristics of wisdom, righteousness, peace, and divine blessedness.

II. That the present world is not, as sciologists and scientists maintain, a perpetual arrangement, an end, a finality, but the means to an end yet future. We are living under a government not permanent, but temporary and provisional. The present dispensation of man's life, which is the true intermediate and probational state, spans the gulf between Eden lost and Paradise restored; between the Alpha and Omega of our mundane *cosmos*. Our world and race await new decrees of destiny from their divine Creator.

III. That it is the purpose of the great Founder and the Builder of all things, at some time in the future to supersede and remodel the present world, and out of its elements to reconstruct a new dwelling-place for man, though still on the earth, which shall "never be moved out of its place," and which "endureth forever;" wherein he shall work out the great destiny for which God intended him in the beginning; when the seed of the woman shall have "bruised the serpent's head;" when there shall be reconciliation and harmony between God and man, and the long-promised "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will toward men," shall be happily realized.

Now we are to consider the means by which these ends are to be compassed; for God works by means to accomplish his will to us-ward; for as by man sin came into the world, and death by sin, so by man comes

also the resurrection from the dead and redemption from the bondage of sin and death.

In his character of "the Builder of all things," we may be assured that as a "wise master builder" He does not build without a design, and that design is perfect in kind, and the highest expression of the Divine benevolence. Having that design as the model before his mind, He proceeds to prepare and construct everything, all its parts, with reference to the plan and end He has preconceived. The Bible accordingly informs us that the great Architect of the world, or *cosmos*, of which man forms a part, has nicely and wisely adjusted the means to the end proposed. "His hand hath laid the foundation of the earth and his right hand hath spanned the heavens ; for Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

The prophet Isaiah informs us, in strains of sublime eloquence, that the great Architect "measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, meted out heaven with a span, comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance." Having finished the task, He saw all the works He had made, and pronounced them, "good, very good ;" and such was the admirable wisdom and the glorious harmony and beauty of their mechanism, that "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

CHAPTER IX.

MR. INGERSOLL'S INCONSISTENCIES—HIS RELIGION
OF HUMANITY.

"Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"—*Words of Christ.*

WE appeal to the good sense of our readers to decide if it is wise to take one for a guide who is himself ignorant of the way; and we ask if one who believes things directly opposite, can be said to know any thing on the subject. Speaking of death, Mr. Ingersoll gives utterance to the following flat contradictions: "It is a wreck which marks at last *the end of all.*" "We strive in vain to look beyond the heights." "On his forehead [the dead man's], fell the golden dawning of *a grander day.* . . . "In the night of death hope sees a star and hears the rustle of a wing." "He [Christ] knew there was *no such thing as death*; He knew that what we call death was but the *eternal opening* of the *everlasting gates of joy.*" These are all in the compass of a single discourse.

He speaks of the "infinite absurdity of vicarious virtue and vice," and, in the same lecture, he says: "Let me say, once for all, that for the man Christ I have infinite respect. Let me say, once for all, that the place *where man has died for man is holy ground.*" Is not this "vicarious virtue?" Mr. Ingersoll asks us to try the claims of the New Testament, a volume con-

sisting of twenty-seven separate books, on the testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, three of them only—though we have proved they support the others. Discarding entirely the books of the Old Testament as attesting the truth of the New, he divorces the proposition from the proof, and modestly asks us to give the Scotch verdict of “not proven.”

“What must we do to be Saved?” the title of his last lecture, is a question propounded in the Book of Acts. He then shuts and hides the book and asks us to find the answer. He propounds one of his own invention, and insists on our acceptance of it as satisfactory. Thus he finds the book to be good enough for the question, but no authority whatever for the answer. He is either ignorant or oblivious of the fact that up to the resurrection and ascension and for nearly ten years afterwards, the Gospel was confined exclusively in its teaching, preaching, and promises, and in its faith and rites, to the Jews; that previously to the resurrection its divine teachers, the apostles, were forbidden by the Master to leave Judea or to carry it to the Gentiles: “Go ye not unto the Gentiles nor into any city of the Samaritans.” “I am sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” It was after his resurrection that the programme was enlarged and they were required to teach all nations, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. It is in the Acts, tenth chapter, that we first meet with the introduction and offer of salvation to the Gentiles, in the house of Cornelius, a Roman Centurion. Yet we here see

that Colonel Ingersoll, a Gentile, by excluding this historical book, the Acts, and confining the examination of his proofs to the three Evangelists, shuts off himself and his race from all claim to gospel salvation, and of course necessarily "proves himself out of court." Such is the consequence of a man, unable to swim, venturing into deep water. This simple explanation takes away the ground of the objection to the New Testament books as competent testimony, which accordingly loses all its force.

It is not proposed to hold Mr. Ingersoll to any rigid rule of consistency. Error is never consistent, and it is only when a sophist assumes the rôle of a Solomon and imposes on the credulity of simple minds to their injury, that the friends of truth think it necessary to interpose. The mistakes of fact and the errors of reasoning already pointed out may suffice to destroy all confidence in the logic of this Bible assailant, and teach him the wholesome lesson in the fable that he "bites a file." But the inconsistency between the title of this last lecture and the creed or no creed he alternately accepts or rejects, is so glaring as to point a moral and provoke a logical transfixion. In reply to the reasonable demand upon him, "What do you propose," he undertakes, with strange mental obliquity, to give us in lieu of Bible Christianity, what he calls the "Religion of Humanity," already defined to us as "good fellowship, good friends, good cooking, good clothes, good houses, and a plenty of soap and water." In respect to this frivolous levity and derogatory style of treating

such a subject, all we have to say of it is, that if it better suits the taste of our author to lay aside the dignity of a grave discussion which relates to the happiness and destiny of our race and world, and descend into the arena as the Mr. Merryman of the circus in his doublet and hose, or as the Court Jester in his fool's cap and bells, it is not for us to object. In our humble judgment Mr. Ingersoll thereby underrates the intelligence and moral sense of the better class of men in every community, though he may gain the plaudits of the unthinking, ignorant, or prejudiced multitude—"lewd fellows of the baser sort," of the apostolic times. But to all the honors to be gleaned on that field of combat he is heartily welcome, without competition. Such men act from ignorance, depravity, prejudice, or some bad motive. They join the vulgar clamor, they know not why, and their hiss, though loud, brings not the pang of a moment. With all such, a sneer is better than an argument, ridicule is better than reason, and a laugh or a ribald jest outweighs the work of the brightest intellect and the profoundest wisdom. "*Non tali auxilio ; nec istis defensoribus.*" * On the other hand, the censure of good and honorable men is the fruit of conviction. It springs from an aversion to what is contrary to their own excellence, and cannot be disregarded. If his religion of humanity proposes no more for mankind than to secure to them in the present life good fellowship, good friends . . . and personal cleanliness, does he not see that its mission is preposterously short? Like the

* Not by such aid—not with these defenders.

Pharisees of old, it undertakes only to make clean "the outside of the cup and the platter, while within they are full of extortion and excess, of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

Such is the outcome of his atheism as a remedy for the ills of this mortal life, the most serious and grievous of which, we know by experience, are not those of our present physical surroundings, but those that spring from mental anguish, from social wrongs, and from painful anxieties respecting our relations to a future life. For these he is forced to confess his gospel offers no remedy. Now it is here that salvation by faith, which he scornfully regrets, comes in to fill this aching void in our hearts, and fully supplies the wants and necessities of our sentient and social existence, such as "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." How infinitely superior the system which fills the measure of all our wants ! To read from the book which Mr. Ingersoll ventures to attack : "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life which now is and of that which is to come." How inconsistent and unreasonable to call on us to exchange the one for the other, to surrender our faith and hope in future blessedness, the unsearchable riches of Christ, for the utter poverty and the dismal dread of the universal blank nothingness of Atheism, the gloom, the despair, and desolation, of Mr. Ingersoll's Gospel.

Looking at the title of Mr. Ingersoll's last lecture, "What must we do to be Saved?" may we not ask,

“saved from what?” Not death, for mankind continue to die, and he does not propose to bestow immortality on his disciples. Not from sin—for of what value is such salvation if men, the best of them, will continue to sin as long as they live, and if sin is never to be punished or banished from our world? From the loss or want of “good-fellowship, . . . good houses, good clothes, pictures on the walls and carpets on the floors, and plenty of soap and water?” Is his humanity scheme an universal insurance society against the want or loss of these? If not, his gospel is a failure and a fraud. If impotent for any certain good in the present life, and if, as he believes, there is no God and no future life, may we not repeat *cui bono*? Let him answer, if he can. He cannot retort the question to the Christian. If he does, the Bible answer is full and explicit: “You shall call his name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins.” His first mission into our world was their salvation from sin. His second, “at His coming and in His kingdom,” will be their salvation and redemption from death and all the pains and sorrows of this mortal life. Rescued from the dominion of death and the grave by their glorious resurrection and conquest of their last enemy, they will be able to sing the triumphant song, “Oh! Death, where is thy sting? Oh! grave, where is thy victory?” adding the soul-stirring refrain, “Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ, our Lord.”

CHAPTER X.

MORALS OF ATHEISM—MR. INGERSOLL AND THE
NIHILISTS.

“ Evil communications corrupt good morals.”—*St. Paul.*

To render full justice to Mr. Ingersoll's moral sentiments we must record his open and avowed sympathy with the work of the Nihilists, those diabolical assassins who are banded together in every country to war upon mankind and to outrage every attribute of individual and national life. In his lecture on “ Skulls, etc.” (p. 139), he says :

“ I suppose Alexander of Russia was put there by the order of God. Was he? I am sorry he was not removed by the Nihilist that shot at him the other day. We telegraphed to that country, congratulating that wretch that he was not killed. . . . *My sympathies cluster around the point of the dagger.*”

Now that the Nihilist regicides have done their work and the Czar Alexander has fallen before the infernal machine of these miscreants, let us inquire into the principles of this great international brotherhood of crime, with which Mr. Ingersoll confesses himself to be in sympathy and whose work he indorses and approves. Like the Russian Nihilists he would of course welcome the same carnival of crime, the same indiscriminate slaughter of the head and all officers of all governments under which men live who do not govern according to

his or their fanciful ideas of wisdom and right. If the President of the United States and his cabinet, or the Congress, should happen to come under the ban of Mr. Ingersoll and the Nihilist assassins, by the morals of his new creed, assassination becomes forthwith the rightful remedy. With him and his confederates, "killing is no murder," and the successful assassin becomes at once a patriot and a hero. We cannot suppose one of Mr. Ingersoll's intelligence to be ignorant of the creed with which he avows himself in sympathy.

A Nihilist (as the name imports from the Latin *nihil*, which means nothing) is one who seeks by violence and "at the point of the dagger," to subvert all existing governments among men, to reduce them to nothing, and to substitute in their place the savagery, crime, and ruin of universal destruction. As a means to this end it proposes, first, to abolish God, and, second, to banish from the world and among men forever all sense of right and wrong. Frightful as this creed is, it is nevertheless advocated and boldly practised in Europe, and as boldly avowed and preached in the United States. Does the reader doubt it? Let him read the proof.

In the New York *Weekly Herald* of March 19th, 1881, we have the programme of Nihilism authenticated to us, and taken from the columns of the journal of the Congress of the Internationals, not long since convened at Berne, Switzerland. This catechism of revolution, this monstrous alliance of Atheism and Nihilism, is heralded to the world as the "gospel of faith of the Nihilists." We are informed "it has been printed in enor-

mous numbers, and has penetrated to every palace and hut in Russia, despite the censors."

The account proceeds :

PHILOSOPHY OF NIHILISM.

The principles of this philosophy of negation may be gathered from the following extracts : " This gospel admits of no half measures and hesitations. The old world must be destroyed and replaced by a new one. The lie must be stamped out and give way to truth. It is our mission to destroy the lie, and to effect this we must begin at the very commencement. Now the beginning of all those lies which have ground down this poor world in slavery is God. Tear out of your hearts the belief in the existence of God, for as long as an atom of that silly superstition remains in your minds you will never know what freedom is. When you have got rid of the belief in this priest-begotten God, and when, moreover, you are convinced that your existence and that of the surrounding world is due to the conglomeration of atoms in accordance with the laws of gravity and attraction, then and then only you will have accomplished the first step toward liberty, and you will experience less difficulty in ridding your minds of that second lie which tyranny has invented. The first lie is God, the second lie is right. Might invented the fiction of right in order to insure and strengthen her reign. Might forms the sole groundwork of society. Might makes and unmakes laws, and that might should be in the hands of the majority. Once penetrated with a clear conviction of your own might you will be able to destroy this mere notion of right. And when you have freed your minds from the fear of a God and from that childish respect for the fiction of right, then all the remaining chains which bind you and which are called science, civilization, property, marriage, morality, and justice, will snap asunder like threads. Let your own happiness be your only law. But in order to get this law recognized and to bring about the proper relations which should exist between the majority and

minority of mankind, you must destroy everything which exists in the shape of State or social organizations. Our first work must be destruction and annihilation of everything as it now exists. You must accustom yourselves to destroy everything—the good with the bad. For, if an atom of this old world remains the new will never be created. Take heed that no ark be allowed to rescue any atom of this old world, which we consecrate to destruction.”

Such is the official record of European Nihilism. We should be reluctant to believe that the deadly poison of such a hideous creed could ever pollute the atmosphere of our free and happy country, if we did not read in the same paper, under the head of “*New York Nihilism*,” the proceedings of a large meeting in the city of New York on March 15th, 1881, convened at the Steuben House.

We have not room to insert the full report of the proceedings, which appear under the headings, “Socialists Exultant over the Czar’s Assassination.” “A meeting in the Bowery that clamored for bloodshed as the political panacea. Communistic ravings, etc.” But the reader and the admirers of Mr. Ingersoll may form a right understanding of the cause and the work around which Mr. Ingersoll’s sympathies cluster in this wholesale conspiracy against the entire fabric of human society, by reading here the preamble and resolutions which were adopted unanimously, as follows :

At the conclusion of Mr. Drury’s address, Secretary McGregor read the following, which was unanimously adopted :—

IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY.

We congratulate the world upon the overthrow of the absolutism of feudal autocracy in Russia.

We congratulate the people of Europe upon the removal of the greatest obstacle to the establishment of the Western Republic or the United States of Europe.

We congratulate our fellow-socialists that the great prop of monarchical institutions, which has supported kingcraft throughout the world, has been shaken to its base by the fall of the Czar, and that the way is being cleared for the foundation of the social republic.

We call upon the liberty-loving people of the United States of America to rejoice in the overthrow of the Czar equally as they rejoiced at the overthrow of Maximilian, whose existence endangered republican institutions.

Resolved, That the following address be forwarded to our fellow-workingmen in Russia, to our best friends and most active partizans, the nihilists :—

Fellow Workingmen of Russia—Between the aristocracy and the proletariat there can be no compromise. Between the parasites and the producers there can be no peace. While louts and loafers live in luxury upon the products of our labor we must suffer and starve.

Brothers ! Your cause is that of the oppressed against the oppressor. That cause is a holy cause ; the cause not only of Russia, but of all countries. It is universal.

Brothers ! We approve your actions ; we approve your methods. Between you and your oppressors there can be no truce.

Kill, destroy, assassinate, annihilate, even to the very germ, your aristocracy. Have for them no feeling of love, for they are incapable of that noble emotion.

THE COMMITTEE.

Comment is needless. Atheism and Nihilism are twin monsters. Guilt and crime are their congenial element, and he is his own worst foe and an enemy to God and man, who is “in sympathy” with either. Thus Mr. Ingersoll by his own confession stands before his countrymen in association and “sympathy” with

murderers and assassins, enemies of all governments and peoples who acknowledge the existence and attributes of God, and who presume to believe in the just distinction between virtue and vice, right and wrong, good and evil. Is not such a man an enemy of the human race? a social Catiline, a maniac with a drawn sword in his hand, an incendiary in a powder magazine, flourishing aloft a flaming torch?

CHAPTER XI.

THE DESIGN OF GOD IN CREATION.

“One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth forever.”

“He created the earth not in vain. He formed it to be inhabited.”

“As I live, saith the Lord, all the earth shall be filled with my glory.”—*Holy Writ.*

THE world in its present organization is not an end, but a means to an end yet future. It is not a permanent but a provisional arrangement of human affairs, constructed with especial reference to an undeveloped but rapidly approaching future which will yield “peace on earth and good will toward men.” It is difficult, nay impossible, to understand and appreciate its creation without a knowledge of the design and purpose of its Creator. That design is revealed to us in the Bible, for without a revelation we should never have attained it. It is this knowledge of God’s purpose which gives

us a key to the comprehension and interpretation of the whole book. * There are two theories extant on this subject. One, the most current, asserts that Christianity, the Gospel system, the Bible religion, is now in full operation, and that its utmost triumphs and its richest fruits are to be expected and displayed among men in the present life ; that the world and the earth on which we dwell is destined to a final catastrophe of overwhelming ruin and destruction ; that the race of man is to become extinct on the earth, which itself is to be stripped of its inhabitants, and then annihilated, and that all the good of our race are to be taken to heaven above the skies, there to be forever happy, while the bad are to be sent to a place of punishment called Hades or Hell, there to expiate their offences by pain and suffering, eternal in duration, and of greater or less severity according to the creed of the particular church. This is with many the current *finale* of the drama of creation.

The other theory maintains that the earth will never be destroyed, and that the race of man will never cease to dwell upon it ; that the righteous and redeemed of mankind will be immortalized ; that the world and the race will be ultimately reclaimed from the sin and suffering of their past and present state, and that the wicked will be dealt with according to their deeds, and that as these last are limited to a life time, so that punishment will be proportional and terminable. And as they are by constitution mortal, and have forfeited all claims to, and made no preparation for, an immortal life,

they will be visited with a just retribution, and, as the end of their punishment, go back to the dust from which they came, and there remain forever; thus suffering the second death, the wages of sin, and will be ultimately destroyed (2 'Thess. 1 : 9). Thus God's violated laws will be vindicated, justice will be meted out, mercy shall be triumphant in removing the incorrigible from the earth, pain and sorrow will be no more, the righteous shall inherit all things, and every curse will be removed from the earth, man's noble inheritance, and he will be once more in blessedness and blissful harmony with his Maker. "The tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God" (Rev. 21), and the devil, death, and hell shall be no more. That the earth, fitted up in great beauty and glory for man's abode, will become the permanent home and dwelling-place of a race of immortal beings, raised from the dead or changed in a moment, if alive, at the coming of Christ, who have been redeemed and developed from the present and pre-existing *cosmos*, and who in their immortalized and perfected excellence will reveal and reflect the wisdom, power, and glory of Him who created and redeemed them. That the future of our race and world is to be worked out on this earth; that, in the language of Holy Writ, "The righteous will be recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner" (Prov. 12 : 30). That the saints shall "inherit all things," and shall reign upon the earth with Christ as their head, the king of Israel and the de-

sire of all nations, for a millennium, or period of one thousand years ; that the wicked, who appear in the second resurrection from the grave, will in their renewed mortal bodies be judged and punished according to their deeds and no more.

Now the Christian who is instructed in the Bible knows that the purpose of God in respect to man and his dwelling place is at present in abeyance of its accomplishment ; that the end is not yet, and that our future is disclosed to us in "the sure word of prophecy, to which we do well to take heed as unto a light that shines in a dark place."

It is the mistake of Mr. Ingersoll and his colleagues that either they accept the first of the theories above presented as that which the Bible offers, or that they discard from their view all considerations of a future life, and are thus forced into a defence of the impossible and untrue, or take refuge in the dark abyss of Atheism.

Not many months ago the New York Sunday *Herald* invited through its ample columns a discussion of the question, "*Is Christianity a failure?*" This question was the natural offspring of the mistake in supposing that the end had been reached, and that the Gospel of Christ had already accomplished its mission, all it had proposed or promised to do for mankind on this earth, in preparing the elect for their blessedness in heaven.

The controversy in the *Herald* took a wide range. At length one disputant suggested that the discussion was premature and illogical, for the sufficient reason

that Christianity was yet on trial, and that the end is not yet, that the time to develop its blessings, its triumphs, and its rewards has not arrived, and that its promised achievement is to be "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will toward men," by means of the return and personal reign of Christ on earth and over all nations, and that to press an answer to the inquiry now would be as unwise and unreasonable as to pass judgment on the comeliness, sufficiency, success, or safety of a house not yet built, from an inspection of the materials which were being accumulated for its construction.

The Bible religion in its present proclamation is the system of means which the Divine Wisdom has devised and declared, to repair the breach between God and man. It is a system of faith and obedience. As man lost the favor and society of his Maker by disbelieving and disobeying God's word in Paradise, it declares that he can only regain and be restored to his original, and the greater blessedness of the Gospel, by believing and obeying the same word of God, against which Adam had rebelled; as it is written, "For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners—so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound, but where sin abounded grace did much more abound, that as sin had reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Hence the broad and unlimited commission: "Go ye into all the world and preach the

Gospel to every creature," to the end that they who hear or read may believe and obey this Gospel proclamation, and secure thereby at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the righteous dead, the salvation, life, and immortality in the Kingdom of God on earth which will then and not till then become an accomplished reality. Such is the design and purpose of God in the creation of the world and in its present preparatory *cosmos*, as disclosed to us in the Holy Scriptures. We incur little risk in opining that of this grand design of the Great Architect, Mr. Ingersoll is ignorant and faithless, and consequently we cannot accept him as a safe guide and expositor of a system of whose beginning, intermediate stages, and end he is entirely uninformed. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth (understandeth) it, it is a folly and a shame unto him."

CHAPTER XII.

THE FUTURE RULER OF THE NATIONS.

"The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations."—*Psalms*, 22.

THAT the world and the race of man need a ruler strong and wise enough to govern them in harmony with the will of God and the happiness of mankind ; that Adam was placed on trial in that position and failed, and was therefore deposed ; and that the object of the remedial system, devised by Almighty power and

love looks to the accomplishment of that purpose still, are all truths readily recognized and admitted by believers in the Bible. This reflection presents to us the question, "Do the world and race possess within themselves the means of rectifying their disorders and the many ills to which they are subject, or must the remedy come from an external source, from a higher power?"

We must admit that human government is so far a failure, and has not as yet effected these objects of the Divine benevolence. Such is the testimony of history, which is but the accumulated experience of mankind. The experiment of near six thousand years in duration, not only without attaining the desired result, but with no visible signs of success in the future by the means now employed by man, would seem to beget an insuperable distrust of the first branch of our inquiry. Indeed such a conclusion, in spite of the confident assertions of visionary optimists, is plainly denied and repudiated by the highest authority, in which we find it expressly declared, "that man at his best estate is altogether vanity," that "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," and that "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God." Hence the admonition: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?" Human experience concurs with revelation in establishing the conclusion that the wisdom of man is not adequate to the government of the world or of his fellow man, or even, indeed, to the rule and control of his own evil nature. Unless, then, help and power come from some source external

to man, the world of mankind must remain forever un-blessed. This plainly compels the conclusion that God alone is great and wise and good, that He alone is competent to the task of ruling and governing, in person or by a sovereign of his appointment, in justice, righteousness, and blessing the earth He has made and the race who inhabit it.

This truth was propounded more than eighteen hundred years ago, under circumstances peculiarly imposing, by the Apostle Paul, as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts. Standing in the Areopagus of Athens, the metropolis of all the wisdom and learning of the ancient world, on Mars Hill, in the presence of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, the most renowned statesmen, scholars, orators, and poets of pagan antiquity, he exposed the shallow superstition of these followers of Socrates and Plato in worshipping at the altar of an "unknown God;" and after announcing to them the astonishing secret of future life, not by means of their Pagan conceit of man's inherent immortality, but by the great Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, he still further confounded their childish wisdom in these extraordinary words: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge (rule) the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

This great truth, the return of Christ as King of Is-

rael, and his personal and visible reign on earth in great power and glory over all nations as the Lord of hosts, as King of kings and Lord of lords, Governor of the nations, King of saints, on the reconstructed throne of his father David, and in Jerusalem, then become the metropolis and the joy of the whole earth, though the cherished faith and hope of the first Christians, has been so long forgotten or ignored in this generation that its announcement now as a literal truth disturbs and startles unstable souls, and frequently provokes opposition and hostility to those who dare to proclaim it. Yet it is a fact which none can deny, that even profane and secular history preserves the record of this early faith of the early Christians.

Gibbon says in his "Decline and Fall" (vol. i., p. 62) : "The ancient and popular doctrine of the millenium was intimately connected with the second coming of Christ ; that Christ, with the triumphant band of the saints who have escaped death or been miraculously (by the resurrection) revived, would reign upon earth until the time appointed for the last and general resurrection. . . . Though it might not be universally received, it appears to have been the reigning sentiment of the orthodox believers, and it seems so well adapted to the desires and apprehensions of mankind, that it must have contributed in a very considerable degree to the progress of the Christian faith.

Macaulay says ("Essays," 668) : "The Christian believes, as well as the Jew, that, at some future period the present order of things will come to an end. Nay.

many Christians believe that the Messiah will shortly establish a kingdom on the earth and reign visibly over all its inhabitants. Whether this doctrine be orthodox or not we shall not here inquire. The number of people who hold it is very much greater than the number of Jews residing in England. Many of those who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability. It is preached from pulpits both of the Scottish and of the English church. Noblemen and members of Parliament have written in defense of it."

If the reader will turn to Acts 17, already quoted, he will find that these Epicureans and Stoics, disciples of Plato, who all taught the theory of future life by the supposed immortality of the soul, took special exception to the apostles' opposing doctrine of life by means of the resurrection of the dead. Hence we read that they accused him of preaching a "new doctrine, of bringing strange things to their ears;" of being a "setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection" (18-19 verses). Their astonishment and indignation reached its climax when, in the conclusion of his speech, St. Paul told them that God had "appointed a day in which he would rule the world in righteousness by his Son, whom he had raised from the dead for that purpose." They mocked him, and turned away in scorn. The resurrection of the dead was to them incredible and an insurmountable stumbling-block, because, if true, they saw that it effectually overturned their cherished superstitions, derived from Thales, Socrates, etc. Let the reader consider how im-

probable that they should have charged Paul with preaching "a new doctrine," "strange things," if he had believed and taught the inherent immortality of the soul, which was their theory of future life. It is then by inexorable logic from these premises that we deduce the conclusion that, then as now, the one grand distinguishing doctrine of Christianity is future life, by the resurrection, in opposition to the crude Socratic theory of the ancient pagans. The exigencies of time and space forbid the citation of the copious testimony in the Bible in support of this position. We cannot deny that immortality is declared by the Bible to be an attribute of God alone, and of those only to whom He will impart it. For is it not written, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord"? That in the resurrection "this mortal shall put on immortality, this corruptible shall put on incorruption. Death shall be swallowed up in victory;" and the immortalized saints will then, and not till then, be able to swell the triumphant anthem, "Death, where is thy sting; grave, where is thy victory?"

While man is in the Bible repeatedly declared to be "mortal," and as we see daily the subject of death, it is written that "the King of kings and Lord of lords *only* hath immortality." It is a fact of great significance and value in this controversy that the Bible religion alone rests on the resurrection from the dead in order to another life, as its distinguishing peculiarity, while all other systems, without exception, are based on

the Pagan dogma of every man's being already inherently immortal ; thereby rendering of little value, if not wholly unimportant, the great Christian doctrine of the resurrection from the dead. Now it is obvious to every reader of Mr. Ingersoll's lectures that he has never learned, perhaps never heard of this Bible doctrine of future life. All his assertions and speculations as to the dead, the fate of the wicked, etc., proceed upon the assumption that the Bible teaches the opposite doctrine and necessitates their everlasting existence in torment. Is it not charitable to suppose that this egregious mistake of Mr. Ingersoll as to the real teaching of the Bible may have betrayed him into the fatal errors and blunders which his best friends must deplore ?

Another consequence of such a dangerous error is that as the knowledge of Christ's coming kingdom and reign on earth, with its cognate doctrine of life and resurrection through him, furnishes the key to the intelligent understanding of the Bible as a whole, it is not wonderful that he should fail deplorably, as he has done, in his efforts to solve the great secret of our future life, which is easily apprehensible to one who has been taught of God's Word, where alone it is disclosed. No resurrection, no future life, is the doctrine of the Bible ; for it is the Author and Finisher of the faith who says : " No man cometh unto the Father but by me. I am the Resurrection and the Life. I hold the keys of death and hell (the grave). "

CHAPTER XIII.

BIBLE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT—ETERNAL
PUNISHMENT NOT ETERNAL PAIN.

“God is love.”—*St. John.*

MR. INGERSOLL plants himself in bold antagonism to the Bible, and justifies his absurd atheism on a huge sophism in his premises. He assumes as the basis of his arguments in hostility to the Bible and its Author, that the blessed book teaches, and is answerable for, the eternal torment of the wicked in the burning flames of hell. This error in his premises pervades all his subsequent reasonings. He never stops to inquire into its truth, nor attempts to prove the charge. In headlong haste, and with characteristic inconsiderateness, he takes his premises for granted, and proceeds with his arraignment of the Holy Book for an offence of which it is entirely guiltless. It is because the Bible does *not* teach the eternal torment theory, which is abhorrent also to reason, that we reject that theory. This obliges us, in the interest of truth, to show not only that the Bible does not teach or encourage or countenance his premises of eternal misery to the wicked, but to prove what the Bible does teach concerning the future destiny of that class.

We accomplish the first part of our task by showing that no such penalty is denounced in the divine law, but that that code declares that God will visit upon

them a retribution only according to their deeds, and punish them even less than they deserve, and that the imputation of a measure of punishment beyond these just and merciful limits finds no sanction or authority in it.

Before proceeding to cite the testimony and state the reasons which lead to these conclusions, I submit, by way of preface, the following extract from a recent publication in an English magazine,* by the well-known author, Henry Constable, M.A., of London, late Prebendary of Cork, which will serve to show the calmer and clearer light in which such discussions are now regarded by an enlightened public. He says: "Among those who accept the Bible as containing a divine revelation to man, the question of future punishment occupies an amount of attention at present, such as it has never done since the days of Tertullian, of Origen, and of Augustine. The views styled orthodox no longer obtain their former assent. The rejection of them is no longer confined to men who hold loosely or have abandoned Christian faith. They are examined, doubted, questioned, denied, and abhorred by multitudes who believe in Christ and in the Scriptures as the Word of God. They are thus being questioned or denied because it is no longer accepted that they are taught in that Word at all. Christian men are beginning everywhere to say or to think that the view instilled into them in childhood, said to have been taught by Christ and his apostles, have no other and no higher source than the

* *The Rainbow* (London), a magazine of Christian literature.

schools of heathen philosophy or the temples of the Egyptian priesthood.

“ We do not speak from hearsay, but from personal knowledge. From every quarter of the English-speaking world we see from print and private letters that the traditional faith upon this subject is being abandoned. Numbers doubt it ; numbers reject it ; even those who hold it hesitate to speak in the confident tone of a by-gone day. Men of ability are chary to come forward in its defence, and no longer seek to prop up a cause fast falling to the ground.”

The doctrine of an eternity of existence and of suffering to the wicked in the flaming fires of hell, once current among the churches of Christendom, is now, happily as we see, generally doubted, and even discarded in the better light of the Bible. It was the natural and necessary offshoot from the Upas-tree of pagan superstition and mythology. With the pagans of Egypt, Greece, and Rome, this conclusion was the only solution they could conjecture of the problem of humanity. Like all men with whom the love of life is the strongest law of nature, the pagan philosophers persuaded themselves that death was not the end of life, for, although his victims seemed to be unconscious and to turn to dust and ashes, in reality they lived on in some invisible world, which their visionary fancy peopled with the departed hosts of their fathers and kindred to which the good and bad are consigned alike. That man, without a revelation from God and left to his own vivid imagination, should have indulged

in these conjectures and vagaries seems not improbable, though many of the more intelligent of these, as Aristotle, Cicero, Atticus, and Sulpicius, rejected them as mere idle speculations.

Ignorant, like the Stoics and Epicureans whom Paul encountered at Athens, of the great Bible doctrine of future life by the resurrection from the dead, of a judgment to come, etc., they had some apology for these crude and unreasonable inferences ; but Mr. Ingersoll, now capable of learning the Bible revelation of the consignment of the wicked to a just punishment only, and according to their deeds, has, in this light, which they did not possess, the means of harmonizing the justice and mercy of the lawgiver, and is therefore without excuse if he continue to reject the truth. What, then, is the Bible doctrine as to the fate of the wicked ? Surely Mr. Ingersoll will not object to interrogating a volume that claims to be a record of the history of our race, of the origin, constitution, and destiny of man. What say the Scriptures ? How readest thou ?

“ *The wages of sin is death* ” has been God’s law for man from the beginning. It was first declared in Eden, and was illustrated and verified in the death of Adam, when he was nine hundred and thirty years old. The sentence declared was in these words : “ In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying (*i.e.*, having become mortal), thou shalt surely die ” (marginal reading of Genesis 2 : 17). If we ask, Is death defined ? what was it to die ? the answer comes to us in chapter 3 : 19 : “ In the sweat of thy face ” (to Adam) “ shalt thou eat

bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken ; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” This tells us that to die is to return to the dust from which we are taken. Being of Adam’s race, and as the stream cannot rise above the fountain, we are partakers of his death as of his life. That this is our sure destiny, experience of our own decay and our almost daily observation of the dissolution of our fellows abundantly prove. And we do not deny it. For we bear witness to the truth of this Bible revelation when we stand around the opening tomb and solemnly repeat the words : “ Dust to dust, ashes to ashes, earth to earth.” Without tracing the cause at present, we deal with the fact only, that we are born into this world under sentence of death, and that our intervening life, from birth to death, is only a reprieve and respite of the execution of that sentence which is sure to come to us at last, even if we should live as long as Adam.

It will be observed that this penalty applies to and involves all men, whether good or bad. Death is the universal leveler. We all go back to the dust. There is no substitute, no discharge in this war, and this not for our own but for Adam’s transgression. But that penalty when executed, discharges that Adamic debt, and we are free, though dead. But what of that? We can be recreated from the dust. So much for the death which has passed on all men. The penalty is universal and inexorable, for it is written (in conformity with our perception of the fact), “ No man can by

any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." (Psalms, 49.)

Now all this relates to the first death, common to all Adam's children, but there is a second death of which we also read in Scripture, and that, too, like the first, unless intercepted, brings man to the dust again. Now a second death implies a second life, since life and death are exact opposites, and as the first death for Adam's sin has consigned us to dust as we have seen, in order to a second death there must be a second life, a restoration of the life we have lost, and consequently this life is bestowed upon us by resurrection or reconstruction from our native dust. We thus see that Adam's sin brings all his race to the grave, and but for Divine interposition to rescue us from that fate we should have remained forever under the dominion of death. To prevent this, and to give our race an opportunity to regain the life we had lost in Adam, our benevolent Creator respites the execution of the death penalty for the period of our life-time, and affords us the means, during that time of probation, of forming a character which will fit and qualify us, if we are willing, for the second life to which He invites us, and for which He supplies the means of preparation and attainment in that remedial system called religion, now known as the gospel of our salvation; and He graciously superadds to the first life we had in Adam the complement of a new and immortal constitution, physical, mental, and moral, by which we shall be never more subject to the calamity of death. Thus we learn that

all men who live in the present life, and who are under times of knowledge and with opportunities of gaining the future eternal life at the resurrection, are on trial for that other and better life. At their resurrection both classes are brought into life again, the good to receive the promised immortal life, and to dwell forever on the new earth, while the bad lose the prize, and, after judgment, receive for the deeds done in the body a punishment according to their works and die the second death, by being remanded back to their parent dust, there to remain forever. This punishment is called the "second death," their "destruction ceasing to be," but never, never, their eternal torment, life in misery, etc. It is apparent from this Bible testimony that the question before us is one of life and death ; that eternal life is promised to the righteous, and eternal death is threatened to the wicked ; that God, who is both our Creator and our Redeemer, has plainly set before us, in the message He has sent to us, first, through his servants, the prophets and, in these latter days, through his Son, the exceeding great and precious promises of life and immortality to allure us, on the one hand, to faith and obedience, and, on the other, to deter us by threats of his just displeasure and the loss of these blessings from rejecting or neglecting the great salvation offered in the gospel. He bids us to choose between life and death ; hence the language we find in the following, among many scriptures : "I call heaven and earth to record to this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing ; therefore

choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” “The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” “If ye live after the flesh ye shall die, but if ye, through the spirit, mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live.” “He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.” “God will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile, but glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile, for there is no respect of persons with God.” “Life and immortality are brought to light through the gospel.” “I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die” (better translated, “Shall not die forever”). “All the wicked will he destroy.” “Whose end is destruction.” “The wicked shall perish,” be no more, be as though they had not been. “They shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of Hosts.”

Christ to the Pharisees: “Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.” “As I live, saith the Lord, I

desire not the death of the wicked, but that he should turn from his wickedness and live." "They shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," "they shall be cast into the lake of fire," "which is the second death."

"He that hath the Son hath life" (by promise). "He that hath not the Son hath not life." "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction . . . but straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leads to life." "The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation (condemnation)."

But time and space forbid further citations. The reader will see that death, destruction, perishing, the second death, being no more, etc., are terms used in their plain literal sense and meaning, to express the fate of the wicked, but not once is their punishment associated with physical torment or eternal misery. If it be objected that other passages, such as Lazarus and the rich man, etc., teach otherwise, it is answered that not a single one of these texts, when fairly interpreted, can logically be made to support the obnoxious and revolting theory. It is not practicable here to take up and refute what was once, but is happily *no longer*, the popular and accepted doctrine. And yet such a destiny is

supposed to proceed from a being whose name is Love, and whose goodness and wonderful works toward the children of men, no less than his word, declare of Him that “*His mercy endureth forever.*”

It is true that the Scriptures teach (Matthew 25), that certain wicked “go away into everlasting punishment and the righteous into life eternal,” but it is a gross mistake to confound everlasting punishment and everlasting pain or misery. Death is the highest punishment for crime known to human laws, and if there were no revival from the dead, no escape from the punishment, it would be obviously an eternal punishment. Punishment may consist as well in the deprivation or loss of what we most highly value without the infliction of pain. A criminal condemned to death, who is deprived of his life without pain, as by taking a strong opiate or by being bled to death, is as effectually punished as if the sentence had been executed with intolerable torment. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and to take our life from us is to deprive us of that which we hold most dear. It is not, therefore, the manner of death but death itself, the loss of life, which constitutes the sting and anguish, and if that loss is perpetual and unending, if there be no revival from the death-state, which thus becomes eternal, is it not an eternal punishment? The punishment of death becomes, therefore, an eternal punishment from its effects. As we have seen from one of our citations, it is declared that the wicked “shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the

glory of his power." Can there be any life in everlasting destruction? Another citation is: "Whose end is destruction." Again, Jude in his general epistle declares "that Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Now Sodom and Gomorrah are buried beneath the waters of the Dead Sea. The fires have been long since extinct. How then can they be suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, except in the effects and consequences of the punishment?

But in truth and in logic, the theory of endless torment sets aside the doctrine of eternal punishment, for punishment implies the completion of the process, the full infliction of the penalty, and it is not easy to see how the wicked being always *punishing*, though never *punished*, can truly be said to suffer *punishment*; they are only punished in part, never in full.

It would leave the subject incomplete to omit all reference to the dreadful popular delusions (now also rapidly passing into deserved oblivion), respecting *hell* as the place of eternal torment, provided for the large majority of our race. Mr. Ingersoll will hardly be surprised to learn, after so many props have been knocked from under him, that this much-abused word has been degraded to the support of "Gorgons and chimeras dire," which exist only in the distempered fancy of the heathen mythologists from whom they have been borrowed. If death, utter destruction, being no more, is the appointed destination of the incorrigibly wicked, we need give ourselves little trouble to explore their

depopulated prison house. A few words will suffice to show the Bible sense and use of the word hell.

In truth the Bible *hell*, whether the Hebrew *sheol* or the Greek *Hades*, is the grave, the general, silent receptacle for all the dead. Both words bear the same signification, viz. : a place covered up, concealed, out of sight—an appropriate designation of the grave. Without taking time to present the critical and philological proof of this, it is enough to state that the translators of our Bible give us from the original word the definitions “grave” and “hell” interchangeably. The English reader may see this in the marginal readings of the reference Bibles. In Psalm 9 we read : “The wicked shall be turned into hell” (*sheol* in the Hebrew and *Hades* in the Greek Septuagint), “and all the nations that forget God ;” while in Genesis 27, when Jacob is lamenting the supposed death of Joseph he says : “I will go down into the *grave* unto my son mourning”—The same word, in both places. In Isaiah 14 we read : “*Hell* from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming,” and in John 5 the Lord saith : “All that are in the *graves* shall come forth,” etc. From these instances and from many more, such as Acts 2 : 31, where Peter on the day of Pentecost cites David’s prophecy of Christ’s resurrection, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (*i.e.*, in the grave), and 1 Cor. 15 : 55 : “Oh grave (*i.e.*, hell), where is the victory,” we learn that these words mean invariably the same thing, and it is only necessary to put the grave for hell wherever it occurs, and you have an incontrovertible argument

and reply to the absurd and pernicious dogma of hell (the grave) being a place of eternal torment for the wicked.

Passing from this merely didactic view and looking abroad with the eye of wisdom and benevolence on the whole sensitive and intelligent creation of God, it will strike us as altogether consistent with his justice and mercy that the unhappy beings who justly incur the displeasure of their Judge and forfeit the new and immortal life He offers them, should rather perish entirely as the final end of a just retribution, than that they should, by a Divine and miraculous arrangement, be kept alive, not merely for long ages of punishment, but even forever and ever in exquisite and indescribable torment. That dogma is utterly inconsistent with the proper end and object of punishment, and cannot, therefore, be true. Reason proclaims certain fixed and unalterable purposes to be answered by punishment. These are, first, to vindicate the authority of the lawgiver, and, second, to deter others by the example from transgression. How can these objects be effected by the infliction of endless torment? The first object is answered effectually by the infliction of the prescribed penalty for sin, which is death; for "the wages of sin is death." Any cumulative or other penalty would be obviously unjust and unworthy of the Lawgiver, and is necessarily excluded on that account. How is the second object of punishment to be attained on the eternal torment theory? for that admits that the righteous who escape the penalty are to become partakers of

the Divine nature and are immortal and incapable of sinning. Surely it is not necessary to hold up to them the terrible warning afforded by the agonies of the damned, for they cannot transgress and do not need that warning. For whose benefit then is the example to be furnished? Obviously there is no use, no object or purpose to be answered, in any rational or righteous scheme of compensation, beyond a just retribution—"a punishment according to their deeds"—and as these are finite and terminable so the penalty must have an end.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY.

"If a man die, shall he live again?"—*Job*.

It has been my object so far in defending the truth of the Holy Scriptures to prove their modern assailant, Mr. Ingersoll, to be fallacious in his premises and false in his conclusions. How far I have succeeded in this task it is for the reader to decide. This little work would fall short, however, of accomplishing its object, and would seem to be incomplete, without some clear demonstration of the truth—some convincing development of the Bible doctrine of man's origin, constitution and destiny.

The history of our race shows that three great questions in every age of the world, have appealed to the

thoughtful intelligence of every human being, with the most intense and absorbing interest. These are :

Whence am I?

What am I?

Whither do I go?

To answer these questions, to give us this knowledge, has called forth the efforts of the wisest and most learned of mankind. Books have been written, sermons preached, and theories advanced to give a satisfactory solution to the great problem of humanity, and yet we are forced to admit that so far the wisdom and boasted learning of the world have proved wholly inadequate to solve the mystery. The reason seems obvious, as soon as it is stated. It is because the answer to these questions has not been sought where alone it can be found, viz., in the Word of God and not in the wisdom and philosophy of man.

MACAULAY in his Essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes" (*Edinburgh Review*), says: "As respects natural religion—*revelation being for the present altogether left out of the question*—it is not easy to see that a philosopher of the present day is more favorably situated than Thales or Simonides" (with respect to theology). "He has before him just the same evidence of design in the structure of the universe which the early Greeks had. We say just the same, for the discoveries of modern astronomers and anatomists have really added nothing to the force of that argument which a reflecting mind finds in every beast, bird, insect, fish, leaf, flower and shell. The reasoning by which Socrates in Xenophon's

hearing confuted the little Atheist Aristodemus, is exactly the reasoning of 'Paley's Natural Theology.' Socrates makes precisely the same use of the statues of Polycleetus and the pictures of Zeuxis, which Paley makes of the watch. As to the other great question—the question what becomes of man after death—we do not see that a highly educated European, *left to his unassisted reason*, is more likely to be in the right than a Blackfoot Indian. Not a single one of the many sciences in which we surpass the Blackfoot Indians, throws the smallest light on the state of the soul after the animal life is extinct. In truth all the philosophers, ancient and modern, who have attempted, *without the help of revelation*, to prove the immortality of man, from Plato down to Franklin, appear to us to have failed deplorably."

So recently as the year 1875, Dr. John W. Draper, the learned author of the work entitled a "History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science," says truly, in his preface: "We still deal with the same questions about which the old philosophers of Greece and Rome disputed: What is God? What is the soul? What is the world? How is it governed? Have we any standard or criterion of truth? And the thoughtful reader will earnestly ask, are our solutions of these problems any better than theirs?"

In short, the conclusions of all the philosophers in their efforts to solve these questions *without the Bible* may be summed up in the confession of David Hume, in his "Treatise on Human Nature," Vol. i. p. 458: "I

am affrighted and confounded with that forlorn solitude in which I am placed by my philosophy. . . . Where am I or what? From what causes do I derive my existence, and to what condition shall I return? I am confounded with these questions and begin to fancy myself in the most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the deepest darkness."

These confessions from Mr. Ingersoll's highest authorities—the wise men of the earth—show us that it has been reserved to Divine Wisdom to dispel this mystery and darkness.

The problem of man's constitution and destiny is explicable only in the light which comes from the Bible—the Word of God. We are shut up to that conclusion. What saith the Scripture? How readest thou? Let us briefly answer.

I. As to man's origin. The Bible plainly declares, "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

What can be clearer and simpler than this declaration? Here is contained in one sentence the revelation of a truth which philosophers and even theologians have for ages past and through multitudinous volumes of human lore, been seeking for in vain.

When we analyze this sentence and compare it with all existing theories of man's origin, we note:

1. That God made *man*—not his body or his soul only—from the dust of the ground.
2. That as yet, and when he was made to stand up

before his Maker, he was mere inert matter, as a locomotive engine just turned out of the shop and with all its mechanical parts perfect, placed on the railway track ready to work when its builder would start it, but motionless, awaiting the external force which was to set it in motion. Thus when man was inspired by the breath of life he became, and is yet, alive—"a living soul."

3. That when that external power is applied, which in Adam's case was the breath of life, no longer motionless, he exhibited all the powers of life and motion which belong to the living soul as we see now. Whatever meaning, theological or otherwise, may be attached to the word *soul*, which there is not time here to consider, we must all admit from the testimony before us, that man in his creation was himself the living soul, and not declared here or elsewhere in the Bible to be an immortal soul, or even possessed of a soul. He became a living soul by the action of the breath of life through his nostrils, upon his organized physical form. Hence he and all creatures formed like himself from the dust of the ground, when energized by the breath of life—the vital air we breathe—become breathing animals, and are therefore living souls. This is expressed to us in the primary meaning of the word *soul*, which signifies a breathing creature, without any reference to the nature or duration of its existence. As such it is applied in the Scripture to man, and to beasts, birds, fishes, etc., in short, to every creature that lives by breathing.

In Genesis 7 : 15 it is written of the animals that

they “went in unto Noah in the ark, two and two, of *all* flesh wherein is *the breath of life*,” the same that Adam had ; and Ibid. verse 22d, that “*All* in whose nostrils was *the breath of life*,* of all that was in the dry land, died.”

Without pretending to define the mode in which Adam inhaled, through his nostrils, the breath of life, we know now by experience and observation that the first act of the new-born infant in coming into the world is to breathe the vital air, and thereby to become alive and to continue to live.

So much for the origin of man. In common with his fellow creatures of the animal race he was in the beginning, and is now, by the wondrous mechanism of the Divine Architect, an organized mass of animated dust, differing from his fellow animals chiefly in the superiority of his organization, in his possession of superior intellect, and in his susceptibility to a higher destiny.

The New Testament concurs with the Old (Genesis 2 : 7, with 1 Corinthians 15 : 45) in this account of man's origin, declaring him to be formed, like the whole animal creation, “from the dust of the ground—a living soul and of the earth—earthy.”

II. *The nature and constitution of man.*

As we have seen it was by the breath of life that Adam became a living soul, so all the animal creation became by the same process living souls also, and we learn in Genesis 1 : 26 that Adam was made their

* In Job 27 : 3 this breath of life is called “The spirit of God in my nostrils.”

king—had “dominion over them all and over all the earth.” Both classes of creation had life, but they had no period fixed for its duration, and were wholly ignorant of death. The lower animal creation remains in this condition of blissful ignorance to the present hour. *Not so man.* As the king of the animal race and the Lord of the whole earth, his capacity for his high position was to be tested and tried. If he proved faithful and obedient to his Sovereign, the Lord God, he would show himself worthy to fill the exalted position he held in the creation and in the earth over which he had been given dominion ; and as he is not qualified to command who has not himself learned to obey, an occasion must be provided to test his loyalty to his Superior. Hence he was placed under law and exposed to the temptation recorded in Genesis 2 : 16 etc. : “And the Lord God commanded the man, saying : ‘Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day thou eatest thereof (dying) thou shalt surely die.’ ”

Here we see death to be the penalty denounced for violation of this, the only law to which the first man was subjected. It is written accordingly, “The wages of sin is death.”

We know the result of the first man’s trial. He did not abide the test. He disobeyed the law and thereby became a mortal sinner. His fall brought

“Death into the world
And all our woe.”

This act of disobedience changed his whole relations toward his gracious Creator and Benefactor, and rendered him unfit for the high rank and dignity to which he had been called, and for further personal association with his Maker. He was accordingly banished from the Divine presence and driven from the garden. The reason for this last act, his expulsion, is thus given : “ And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil : and now, *lest* he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and *eat, and live for ever* : therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man : and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.” (Gen. 3 : 22, etc.)

As man rebelled against his Sovereign, so his subjects revolted against his rule. The beasts of the field no longer rendered him a willing obedience, and the earth—his dwelling-place—no longer a garden of delights, yielding her fruits spontaneously in prodigal abundance, brought forth thistles and thorns to vex him, and gave him bread only in sorrow and in the sweat of his face. He was reminded of his humble origin, the dust of the ground, and told that the death penalty he had incurred would, when executed, consign him again to his parent dust ; in the words of his sentence, “ dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” This is undoubtedly the Bible and the only true account of man’s origin and destiny as the offspring of the first Adam *only*.

Again inviting the reader's candid analysis of the law we have cited and its penalty, we see that in the prohibition of the forbidden fruit a test of Adam's obedience was contrived. The act prohibited might have been in itself innocent or indifferent, but being a positive law, emanating from the Divine will, its criminality consisted in its being a violation of God's command and an affront to the Divine Majesty. The narrative shows us that the act sprung from disbelief of God's Word and the belief, instead, of the falsehood of the tempter's assurance, "That he should *not* surely die."

We see also that the penalty, death, was not immediately inflicted. All agree that the marginal reading of verse 16 should be "*dying*, thou shalt surely die," which gives scope for the Divine benignity in respiting the execution of the sentence on the culprit for nine hundred and thirty years—the full term of Adam's life—when he died. This reprieve was for a purpose. That Adam's race might not be left in hopeless despair, a second Adam, "the seed of the woman," was promised, who should ultimately crush the serpent's head and deliver man from the continued bondage of sin and death. This brings us to our third question.

III. *Whither do we go?*

To the grave.

The Bible answers this question. It is necessary to observe that if there had been no second Adam there would have been no second or future life; for death is a complete process, which involves in its broad sweep our entire being, and we argue that as the command

and the prohibition in Eden were addressed to the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, the *whole man* was involved in the transgression and suffers the penalty, which is death.

It is no answer to this reasoning to say, with the philosophers and schoolmen, that man is inherently immortal, and that although the penalty of death consigns his body to the dust, that other part of him, his soul or spirit, escapes the death penalty and survives in a conscious existence forever. We reply that apart from the entire absence of any such statement in the Bible, and the many proved passages of Holy Writ which expressly declare the contrary, such as "*Thou shalt surely die,*" "*The soul that sinneth it shall die,*" "*The wages of sin is death,*" etc., we have the striking fact, of obvious significance, that as the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, was addressed in the command and prohibition, and the whole man committed the transgression, so the whole man, and not a part of him, must necessarily bear the penalty, which is death.

This conclusion is abundantly supported by Holy Writ, which elsewhere declares, "*That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts (animals); even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.*" (Eccles. 3 : 18-21.) From these premises it results inevitably that neither Adam nor his posterity had any promise, claim, or just expectation of a future life

by reason of the Adamic nature, inherently or otherwise. The death penalty levels all his posterity to the dust of the ground, depriving his race of all hope of life, derived from him, and but for the interposition of the second Adam they would remain forever in the grave without one survivor of the common wreck.

This second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Lord, has now appeared, and by His superior strength and virtue, through faith and obedience, has triumphed over temptation, sin, and death, as shown by His resurrection unto immortal life, and His exaltation to God's right hand, whence He will come a second time unto salvation to those who look for Him and love His appearing. By Him all of Adam's race who, like Him, become faithful and obedient to the gospel He has announced, though not exempt meanwhile from the death penalty which they incur as the first Adam's descendants, shall arise from the dead, and by this re-creation to a new life at His coming and kingdom, attain to that immortality which the first Adam never possessed and could not therefore transmit to his posterity.

Thus we see that man has a present and an ulterior destiny before him. First, his destination is to death and the grave ; he returns to the dust from which he came. Second, if he prove firm and loyal to God's Word under the trial of his faith and obedience in the present probationary state of good and evil, he will be rescued from the captivity of death and the grave, and by resurrection from his native dust at the second coming of Christ, attain to a new and immortal life bestowed by Him who

alone is the resurrection and the life. Like Adam, man is also on trial. God does not deny to Adam's race, to whom his law is given, the same opportunity to gain immortality and have dominion over the earth and its inhabitants which was offered to him. He says to all such what he said to Cain at the altar, though guilty before Him, "Why art thou wroth? Why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?"

Adam and Christ stand at the head of two systems. These represent respectively death and life. St. Paul, certainly a competent commentator, presents the sharp contrast between them in his famous argument in I. Corinthians 15, styling them the first and the second Adam.

He says: "The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening (life-giving) spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural;* and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy (during our present Adamic life), we shall also bear (in the future life) the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery (*i.e.*, I explain to you a secret):

* McKnight translates it "animal or soul-ical—the soul-man."

we shall not all sleep (die), but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead (not their bodies only or their supposed immortal souls, but the dead—men and women) shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.* For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

In another part of the same full-proof chapter he reasons convincingly again: "Since by man (Adam) came death, by man (Christ) came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming. Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Obliged by the want of time and space to curtail our proofs of the proposition that it is by the resurrection and not till then that man will awake from his unconscious death-sleep to the new and immortal life promised

* See parallel passage in 1 Thess. 4:15, which reads: "We which *are alive* and remain to the coming of the Lord," etc.

to the righteous, or to phrase it in exact Scripture language, that "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then (and not till then) shall we appear with Him in glory," we must rely on the intelligence of the reader, Bible in hand, to fill in by evidence in detail the great argument which here of necessity is only briefly outlined.

As a friend of truth and an humble defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, the writer deploras the mistake which the old philosophers and their modern followers and copyists have made (honestly no doubt), in attributing immortality to *all* men, because of their Adamic origin and nature, and without any reference to the Prince of Life, to Him who is "the resurrection and the life, who hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel, and who only hath immortality." Surely it is time for us all to learn the simple lesson of Holy Writ that "the wages of sin is death, and the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

Now we argue that if, on the one hand, these wages be *death*, then surely it is *not* eternal misery in hell, and on the other hand, if eternal life be the gift of God through Jesus Christ, surely all men do not possess it without reference or relationship to Him.

In the Bible we have the beginning and the end, the Alpha and Omega of the wondrous system of divine love, and mercy, and wisdom, and power. In Genesis, chap. 1 : 1, we read: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," and in Revelation, chap.

21 : 6, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth ; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away. . . . Behold I make all things new." The wonderful book opens with the creation of the world and closes with the promise of another and a new world. The present and past ages, with the coming days of human existence, span the gap between the present and the coming *cosmos*. The present life is the true intermediate state of man. He lives under a provisional, not a permanent government ; the organization of the heaven and the earth in which we live, with all its physical, civil, and social elements, forms a means to an end yet future. The world and its inhabitants await new decrees of Divine destiny. When these are executed the design of the Great Architect in the creation of man and his dwelling-place will have been accomplished, and will be read and known of all men. His wisdom, power, and love will be vindicated and declared, and the grand jubilee of earth's redemption shall be announced in the royal proclamation, "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain. The former things have passed away. Every curse shall be removed," and "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people ; and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God."

CONCLUSION.

NOTHING manifests more clearly the recklessness of assertion, the unfairness, the entire incapacity to reason, and the blind contempt for popular intelligence, than the latest *Lecture* delivered by Mr. Ingersoll, since the foregoing pages were written. On Sunday, the 1st of May, at the Academy of Music in New York, he lectured on "*The Great Infidels*," as reported in the New York *Herald*. In it he presumes to say without scruple: "There is no recorded instance where the uplifted hand of murder has been paralyzed by Divine command; not one instance where suffering innocence has been saved by God's interference." Now, Mr. Ingersoll must have known at the very moment he uttered this statement, that the Bible, in disproof of it, gives almost innumerable historical and "recorded instances" of such interference. Is he willingly ignorant or consciously oblivious of God's interference in behalf of Noah and Lot, of the history of Abraham and Isaac, of Joseph and of Moses, of Daniel in the lion's den, of the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, of Mordecai and Esther, of David from Saul's murderous rage, and of the whole nation of Israel from the pursuit of the Egyptians at the Red Sea, not enumerating the more modern instances in the New Testament in the lives of the apostles? With equal recklessness he classes such men as Jefferson, Franklin, etc., as rejecters of God and the Bible, when he should know the

contrary ; choosing arbitrarily and to suit the necessities of his position to write down every man, like himself, an Atheist, who may condemn some particular form or dogma of religious faith or practice, either Catholic or Protestant.

As to Thomas Jefferson, the charge of being an infidel in Mr. Ingersoll's sense of the term is flatly opposed by the following emphatic declaration of that great man in respect to the value of the Bible. In one of his published letters, he says : " I have always said, and always will say, that the studious perusal of the sacred volume will make better citizens, better fathers, and better husbands."

As to Dr. Franklin, the same charge is repelled by his strong testimony as follows : " As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire, I think the system of morals and His religion as He left them to us is the best the world ever saw or is likely to see."

We all remember, too, Franklin's eccentric but significant inscription, left behind him for an epitaph, in which, as showing his faith in the Bible, he wrote that although in death, like the cover of an old volume, his body should reappear at the resurrection " in a new edition, revised and corrected by the Author."

The French Diderot, too, cited by Mr. Ingersoll in the same class, declared, as if in involuntary admiration of the holy book : " No better lessons than those of the Bible can I teach my child."

But Mr. Ingersoll's audacity reaches the climax when he actually asserts that Christ was an infidel, saying :

“I like Him because He was an infidel, because He could see the frailties of the Jewish worship.” Such insane ravings need no reply ; they carry along with them their own refutation. They stamp their author, however, with folly and shame. The only apology we can, in mercy, invent for him in this instance is his profound ignorance of the Bible and of the history and mission of Christ. So far from His condemning the Jewish worship, He conformed to it when it was in accordance with the Law of Moses, declaring that He came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil them ; that not one jot or tittle of the Law should pass away till all be fulfilled. The Scriptures expressly declare that “the Law (of Moses) was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith ; but after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster” (Galatians 3 : 24, 25). But when He died on the cross saying, “*It is finished,*” and when the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, to indicate to the Jews that the Temple worship had been abolished, and by His death, resurrection, and ascension all its shadowy rites had been merged and fulfilled in Him whom they typified, the Law had passed away and the Gospel, which was its substance, had taken its place. Henceforth the Law ceased to possess any binding force even for the Jews, much less for Gentiles, who were never under its yoke.

As St. Paul did not disdain to support his argument by quoting to the Athenians the testimony of “certain of their own poets” to the same conclusion, we may fol-

low his example in presenting to the reader the following auxiliary authority of the "wise men" of this generation.

From "Atheism and the Church," by G. H. Curties, in the English *Contemporary Review*, we extract the following : "No branch of science seems to consider itself complete, nowadays, until it has issued at last into the vexed ocean of theology. Thus Biology writes lay sermons in Professor Huxley ; Physics acknowledges itself almost Christian in Professor Tyndall ; Anthropology claims to be religious in Mr. Darwin ; and Logic, in Mr. Spencer, confesses that a religious system is a normal and essential factor in every evolving society. It is only the second-rate men of science that loudly vaunt their ability to do without religion altogether and proclaim their fixed and unchangeable resolve for its entire suppression. As well resolve to suppress the Gulf Stream or the eccentricity of the earth's orbit. If the horizon of man's thought is bounded on all sides by mystery it is in simple obedience to the law of his nature that he gives some shape to that mystery. The old school divines meant what they said, that 'Theology was the queen and mistress of the sciences,' and Dr. Pusey in his University sermon (November, 1878) declares, 'Theology accepts every certain conclusion of physical science as man's unfolding of God's book of nature.' "

The foregoing pages have been written in the earnest hope of arresting the pernicious influence of Mr. Ingersoll's teachings on the minds of the ignorant, the young, and the thoughtless, who are easily led captive by the

reckless freedom and the bold and florid style of the orator. It is not possible, we suppose, to enable Mr. Ingersoll to see the truth we have laid before him. Such men are not often convertible or even convincible. They are either too wise to learn or too old to reform. They are leaders, and must not allow their disciples to discover their ignorance or mistakes. Hence they rest under a disability, in some sense, to see or to decide according to the light of truth. They boast of the largest liberty, but are in reality slaves to their prejudices or preconceptions, to their conceit and vanity.

Mr. Ingersoll boasts that these lectures have excited the "admiration of the intelligent." Whether this is true we have not the means of knowing. It depends on his own assertion, which we have had abundant reason to see must always be taken with many grains of allowance. He lectures for pay, and it is said he finds the business very remunerative. It is perfectly allowable for any teacher of good things, who seeks to add to the sum of human happiness and to benefit his fellows, to receive compensation for his services. Such men render an honorable and honest *quid pro quo*. But can any man (Mr. Ingersoll not excepted) show that his disciples or hearers are benefited in the least degree by his attempted proof of atheism? Does atheism heal the sick, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, enrich the poor, inform the ignorant, reclaim the vicious, stimulate the virtuous, educate the masses, or make men wiser or better as citizens, fathers, husbands, sons, brothers, or friends?

His religion of humanity confesses its utter helplessness beyond the present brief mortal life. Life is its narrow boundary, and death is its goal. Shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon all beyond. Not a spark of light, not a ray of hope cheers the fainting mind during man's brief and fleeting existence. Mr. Ingersoll's address at the funeral of his brother tells the sad tale. It is a "wailing cry" of utter despair. It is the stifled moan from the dark and dreary tomb. Midnight darkness shrouds the scene, and his utterances are as contradictory as his creed is cold and cheerless. Hear him, at the grave of his brother :

"While yet in love with life and raptured with the world, he passed to silence and pathetic dust. Yet after all it may be best just in the happiest, sunniest hour of all the voyage, while eager winds are kissing every sail, to dash against the unseen rock and, in an instant, hear the billows roar a sunken ship. For whether in mid-sea or among the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck must mark at last the end of each and all. And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jewelled with a joy, will at its close become a tragedy as sad, and deep, and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death. . . .

"He climbed the heights and left all superstitions far below, while on his forehead fell the golden dawning of a grander day. . . . A thousand times I've heard him quote the words : 'For justice all place a temple, and all season summer' " (whatever that may

mean). . . . "Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word, but in the night of death, hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing. . . . He who sleeps here, when dying, mistaking the approach of death for the return of health, whispered with his latest breath, 'I am better now.' Let us believe, in spite of doubts and dogmas and tears and fears, that these dear words are true of all the countless dead."

Such is the atheist's end—in utter absence of all faith and hope—in wailing despair !

In the midst of the wonders of creation Mr. Ingersoll demands the proof of a Creator, as the simpleton at noonday would ask if there is a sun.

The following little poem by JOHN MASON GOOD, author of the "Book of Nature," may serve to rebuke and confound the boasted wisdom of atheism, and teach a lesson which, when once learned, exalts a simple child in the scale of being above the wisest undevout philosopher that ever lived.

THE DAISY.

Not worlds on worlds in phalanx deep
 Need we to prove that God is here,
 The daisy fresh from winter's sleep
 Tells of His hand in lines as clear.

For who but He who arched the skies,
And pours the dayspring's living flood,
Wondrous alike in all He tries,
Could rear the daisy's purple bud ;

Mould its green cup, its wiry stem,
Its fringed border nicely spin,
And cut the gold-embossed gem,
That, set in silver, gleams within?

And fling it, unrestrained and free,
O'er hill and vale and desert sod,
That man, where'er he walks, may see
In every step the stamp of God.

THE END.

SUPPLEMENT.

PART I.

THE INGERSOLL-BLACK CONTROVERSY REVIEWED.

THE BIBLE VINDICATED ON ITS OWN PREMISES OF REASON
AND REVELATION, AND NOT ON THE SANDY FOUN-
DATION OF HUMAN WISDOM AND AUTHORITY.

*To the Law and to the Testimony: If they speak not according
to this Word, it is because there is no light in them.—ISAIAH.*

I receive not testimony from man.—WORDS OF JESUS.

1882.



THE INGERSOLL-BLACK CONTROVERSY REVIEWED.

Since the publication of the first edition of this work in June, 1881, *Mr. Robert J. Ingersoll* has been brought to bay in his wild raid on all the religions in the world, while "going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it—seeking, like a roaring lion, whom he may devour." His boastful challenge to debate the truth of the Christian Religion has been at length accepted. This champion of the Christian faith appears in the HON. JEREMIAH S. BLACK, a distinguished citizen of Pennsylvania, justly eminent among his countrymen, in both State and National affairs—an able lawyer and jurist, filling for years a high judicial position in his native state, and more recently the office of Attorney General of the United States, on the wider theatre of the Federal Government at Washington. The abilities of Judge Black, as Statesman, Jurist, and Scholar, especially skilled by his long experience and training as a logician, leave nothing, so far as such acquisitions confer qualifications, to be desired in scholastic learning and forensic skill requisite for the task undertaken. To

this it must be added that Judge Black is an honest and earnest believer of the system he undertakes to defend, having been for years a member of the denominational religious fraternity known as the Disciples, or the "Christian Church." The pages of the *North American Review* of date August and November, 1881, present to the public the initial numbers on either side, of this famous discussion under the head of "The Christian Religion."

The controversy thus begun has come, however to an abrupt conclusion. Judge Black complained that the terms on which he had agreed to discuss with Mr. Ingersoll, the authenticity of the Bible and the truth of the Christian Religion, contained a stipulation that his replies should always appear in the same number of the Review, which contained his opponent's attacks, so that, as he said, "the antidote should follow the poison." He alleges that this contract was broken by the Editor, and hence he declined to continue the controversy.

It may seem bold, but it is not too much to say, in the interest of truth, that this result is perhaps not to be regretted, for as each disputant stood on false premises and so held a false position, persistence in the debate under such disabilities would have issued in a mere logomachy, a war of words, which, without being convincing and conclusive, would, at best, have shown only a preponderance of argument on the one side or the other, leaving the truth in abeyance. This conclusion will be apparent for reasons which will presently be stated, and meantime it is scarcely necessary to remind the intelli-

gent reader, that no conclusion in argument can be sound or satisfactory, which rests upon defective premises. No vindication of the Christian religion can be successful which misstates or ignores the foundation of the system, and no assault on its integrity, however violent, is consistent or effectual which does not grapple with the pillars which support the structure.

The grand peculiarity—the marked characteristic—of the Bible religion, that which distinguishes it from all other creeds, Pagan and Heathen, Infidel and Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant, is the Revelation of a future life to man, *by the resurrection from the dead, and by that means only*. This Guiding Star in every intelligent reasoner's horizon seems to have escaped the attention of both these combatants. Yet it is certainly true that all other creeds and religions and all sects in moral philosophy, rest their doctrine of a future life to man, not on the Bible basis of the Resurrection, but on their belief in the inherent immortality of the soul. This huge sophism lies at the bottom of all systems of error in religion and moral philosophy. We may be pardoned, therefore, for dwelling, for a moment, on the proof of this position, for, if neither disputant is awakened to the value of this controlling factor in the discussion, they have undertaken a vain task.

It is familiar knowledge that of the seven Bibles or sacred books of all known religions in the world, each one, except the Christian Bible, avows the creed and doctrine of the inherent immortality of the human soul

or life, and the corresponding, consequential dogma of the future eternal torment of the wicked class of our race. The Koran of the Mahommedans, the Eddas of the Scandinavians, the Try Pitikes of the Buddhists, the Five Kings of the Chinese, the three Vedas of the Hindoos and the Zendavesta of the Persians, all, without exception, teach the immortal soul theory and are profoundly silent, as they are profoundly ignorant, of the Scripture doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, which our Holy Scriptures, the Christian Bible, reveals to us, as the only pathway to future life. It is this Sacred book that propounds, with the irresistible authority of both Reason and Revelation, the grand scheme of Divine wisdom and love for the redemption of our race from the dominion of death and the bondage of the grave.

It is true, and we do not deny that every intelligent Christian "professor" avows his faith in the resurrection of the dead, or, as he prefers to call it, "the resurrection *of the body*,"—a form of expression which allows room to include also his faith in the immortality of the soul. He makes the mistake of supposing that this dual creed is homogeneous and harmless, whereas it is easily shown that the two are "wide as the poles apart," and cannot be reconciled in any rational and consistent theory of man's creation, constitution and destiny. The one creed affirms that man, being immortal can never die; the other, affirms of man, "Thou shalt surely die." The one affirms every human soul will live forever. The other. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." The one declares, "Dust

thou art and to dust returnest' was not spoken of the soul." The other, addressing the first living soul, saith, "Dust thou art and unto dust *shalt* thou return." The one, to man, "Thou shalt ascend to Heaven as soon as thou diest." The other, "No man ascendeth unto Heaven but the Son of Man who came down from Heaven." The one, that the dead are alive and in a conscious state—in Heaven or Hell, Paradise or Purgatory. The other, "The dead know not anything. In that very day [of death] their thoughts perish." "There is no device, nor work, nor knowledge in the grave whither thou goest." and so onward to almost indefinite extension, the broad contrast continues. Like parallels, the lines never meet.

Under the influence of this false theory—of this mistaken interpretation of man's constitution and destiny, however sincerely entertained—Judge Black, in the discussion, yields to his opponent the vantage-ground of confounding him by the adverse testimony of his own witness—the Bible—which everywhere testifies against him. By adopting this pagan dogma, current in Egypt and the East, the dark land of superstition and idolatry, and imported by Thales, Socrates and Plato into the Grecian mythology, and thence, unhappily, boldly interpolated into the Christian's creed, Judge Black, logically and of necessity, virtually surrenders the Christian's citadel—the resurrection of the dead—and becomes the advocate or apologist of the eternal torment theory, which is its inevitable sequence: For if every man be immortal,

the bad must live forever in the punishment to which divine justice consigns them at the judgment day. With them, to live forever is to suffer forever. This last enormity is naturally seized on by Mr. Ingersoll as an invincible weapon of warfare, and easily converted into an unanswerable argument against the divine mercy and justice, and is regarded by all fair and honest men as the *odium theologicum* of the Christian's faith. It thus becomes a rampart behind which, as an impregnable Gibraltar, the infidel hurls his most effective bolts against the Bible as the supposed source and authority of that most unmerciful and revolting dogma, although it be a charge of which the blessed book is wholly guiltless ; for no such doctrine is found in its pages.

Again, being confessedly uninformed as to the origin, uses and continuance of evil for a time in the present and future state, Judge Black does not meet, but is obliged to ignore or evade, his opponent's argument based upon the imputed malevolence of the Creator displayed in the same endless misery creed. That we may not be suspected of doing him an injustice, we quote Judge Black's words in replying to Mr. Ingersoll's first paper. He says : "Why man is made to fill this particular place in the scale of creation, lower than the angels, yet far above the brutes, not passionless and pure, not mere machines—able to stand, yet free to fall ; knowing the right, yet accountable for going wrong ; gifted with reason, yet impelled by self-love to exercise the faculty—these are questions upon which we may have our

speculative opinions, *but knowledge is out of our reach.*"

* * * * "Our ignorance of the whole scheme makes us poor critics upon the small part that comes within our limited perceptions."—p. 133. Again, in answering Mr. Ingersoll's objection that "the punishment of sinners in eternal hell is excessive," he says: "The future of the soul is a subject on which *we have very dark views.*" * * *

No revelation has lifted the veil between time and eternity. * * * Doubtless many of us are in error, but how can Mr. Ingersoll enlighten us?"—p. 148.

If his views upon such subjects are shrouded in "darkness," if "many of us are in error," if we have "no revelation," and "knowledge is out of our reach," how can he gainsay any of Mr. Ingersoll's injurious charges? What advantage hath Christ over Belial? What difference between him that believeth and an infidel? Who can affirm—who can deny—seeing that both are equally in the dark, and are, at best, merely agnostics, or know-nothings?

To carry into the argument such ignorance of the Bible doctrine of time and eternity, and the damaging weight of the dogma of the eternal misery of any of God's creatures, so justly obnoxious to all our ideas of human justice even, and so revolting to Divine mercy and benevolence, is to cripple and at last, under the weight of his armor, to overwhelm its champion in disaster and defeat. This the sagacity of his opponent is not slow to discover, and quickly turns to his advantage. Let the bold infidel grapple with the uprising lion in his

path—the resurrection of the dead, as the only means and hope of future life, and we shall see how speedily his slight and fragile weapons are broken in pieces against the stone of stumbling and the rock of offense which God places before him:

"Hic labor—Hoc opus est."*

The writer does not hesitate to maintain, what he submits is entirely accordant with human intelligence, that no man, however gifted in intellect and eminent in learning, can successfully defend the Bible against the assaults of infidelity who admits, or attempts to maintain, the immortal soul theory and its inevitable outgrowth, the eternal torment of the wicked. These together form for the infidel an iron-clad battery, which turns aside every weapon of the Christian champion, however skillfully forged and formidable in appearance. It is only necessary to state the proposition that man is immortal and must necessarily live forever, to refute it. The theory is overturned when confronted by reason and our own experience, and observation, and especially by the direct testimony of Scripture: "In the day that thou eatest thereof (dying) thou shalt surely die," could have had no meaning addressed to an immortal being. So too, the other texts would have been equally contradictory: "Dust *thou* art, and to dust *thou* shalt return." "The wages of sin is *death*, and the gift of God is eternal life, (immortality), through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

*"This is the labor before us.

"This is work indeed."—[TRANSLATOR.]

Such plain testimony overwhelms the Bible champion with confusion and defeat.

By the same plain and easy proof, the advocate or apologist of the endless misery of the wicked class, supposed to be the most numerous of our race, is driven from the field of argument by the clear and oft-repeated testimony of Scripture that "God is love;" that "His mercy endureth forever;" that "he will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever;" that "He knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust;" that "the wicked shall be destroyed, shall utterly perish and be no more"—"be as if they had never been;" that there shall be in the appointed future before us, "*no more pain* nor death, and that every curse shall be removed from man, and the new earth shall be his future dwelling-place forever."

This controversy, involving the constitution and the destiny of man, is of great antiquity. It is almost coeval with creation. It had its origin in the garden of Eden. It was the serpent, the father of lies, as our Lord styles him, who invented and first preached to Adam and Eve, the false doctrine now reiterated by Judge Black, and I am sorry to add by his orthodox clerical allies, and falsely ascribed by Mr. Ingersoll, and by them, to the Bible—"Ye shall *not* surely die," in rebellious contradiction of Jehovah. Our first parents had been warned and specially admonished beforehand, in case of their transgression of his word, "Ye *shall* surely die." Alas, what a burning reproach to the accepted and orthodox

creeds of Christendom, (so-called), that for ages past and to this hour, following Plato and Socrates and rejecting Jehovah and Jesus, men continue to affirm with the serpent, and in company with pagan philosophers, "Thou, O man, art *immortal*! Thou shalt *not* surely die," which of course necessitates, as to the wicked, their continuous existence, and endurance of eternal misery and anguish.

Involved in the meshes of Satanic sophistry and contradiction, how can the Christian champion in this controversy, on such premises, escape a final overthrow? Is it wonderful that he cannot defend that which he confesses, as we have seen he does not understand, and supposes to be shrouded in impenetrable darkness?

But does his antagonist, the other disputant, stand on any firmer ground? Hear his confessions at the grave of the little boy in the Washington cemetery, as chronicled in the public journals and not denied! At a little boy's grave, as reported in the *Washington Post* of January 9th, Mr. Ingersoll said:

My Friends:—I know how vain it is to gild a grief with words, and yet I wish to take from every grave its fear. Here in this world, where life and death are equal kings, all should be brave enough to meet what all the dead have met. The future has been filled with fear, stained and polluted by the heartless past. From the wondrous tree of life the buds and blossoms fall with ripened fruit, and in the common bed of earth the patriarchs and babes sleep side by side.

Why should we fear that which will come to all that is? We cannot tell, we do not know, which is the greater blessing, life or death. We cannot say that death is not a good. We do not know whether the grave is the end of this life, or the door of another, or whether the night here is not somewhere else a dawn. Neither can we tell which is the more fortunate—the child dying in its mother's arms, before its

lips have learned to form a word, or he who journeys all the length of life's uneven road, painfully taking the last slow steps with staff and crutch.

Every cradle asks us, "Whence?" and every coffin, "Whither?" The poor barbarian, weeping above his dead, can answer these questions as intelligently and satisfactorily as the robed priest of the most authentic creed. The tearful ignorance of the one is just as consoling as the learned and unmeaning words of the other. No man standing where the horizon of a life has touched a grave, has any right to prophecy a future filled with pain and tears. It may be that death gives all there is of worth to life. If those we press and strain against our hearts could never die, perhaps that love would wither from the earth. May-be this common fate treads from out the paths between our hearts the weeds of selfishness and hate, and I would rather live and love where death is king than have eternal life where love is not. Another life is nought unless we know and love again the ones who love us here.

They who stand with breaking hearts around this little grave, need have no fear. The larger and nobler faith in all that is and is to be, tells us that death, even at its worst, is only perfect rest. We know that through the common wants of life—the needs and duties of each hour—their grief will lessen day by day, until at last this grave will be to them a place of rest and peace—almost of joy. There is for them this consolation: The dead do not suffer. If they live again their lives will surely be as good as ours. We have no fear. We are all children of the same mother, and the same fate awaits us all. We, too, have our religion, and it is this: Help for the living—Hope for the dead.

It need not surprise us that the infidel rejector of God's word should be confessedly in gross darkness, when called upon to answer "the whence and the whither" of human life—that he should "not know which is the greater blessing, life or death—whether the grave is the end of this life or the door to another." It is true, as he affirms, that "the poor barbarian, weeping above his dead, can answer the questions as intelligently and satisfactorily as the robed priest of the most authen-

tic creed," but it is not the whole truth. If the "robed priest," while confessing with intelligent candor, that *he* has nothing to offer in reply to the whence and the whither, will add that Revelation—the Bible—answers these questions fully and triumphantly, the problem is solved, and all difficulty disappears. But if the priest, like Judge Black, admits that he is ignorant of, or does not understand the Bible, and that it is to him a sealed book, then indeed the riddle remains a riddle still.

The Christian instructed in his faith cannot afford, however otherwise agreeable, to accept the championship against the infidel of one who is only at best, an agnostic*—who openly confesses, as we see, that he can only grope his way by the light of "speculative opinions"—that "knowledge is out of our reach"—that "the future of the soul is a subject on which we have very dark views—that "no revelation has lifted the vail between time and eternity." In short, "whose ignorance of the whole scheme" unfits him to accept or to discard any conclusion whatever. But let not the infidel rejoice in anticipated victory. "All such rejoicing is vain." God's revelation to man, far from leaving us in darkness as to the taunting "whence and whither" of the presumptuous atheist, sheds the full blaze of light and knowledge on the problem, both of the origin and of the destiny of our race. Its language is: "I am the light of the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness,

*Agnostic—One who knows nothing. In religion, one who admits everything and denies nothing in a creed—in opposition to the infidel gnostics of the first century, who boasted of knowing everything.

but shall have the light of life. The light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not. This is the true light, which, coming into the world, enlightens every man." It is from this source of Life and Light that man is enabled to see the truth which dispels his native darkness—emancipates the servant of God from the bondage of ignorance and fear, and makes him "free indeed."

The Christian religion is easily defended on its own merits. It neither seeks nor accepts the proffered aid of human wisdom, speculative opinions, or science, falsely so-called. The Author and Finisher of our faith says expressly: "I receive not testimony from man." John v. Why? For the all-sufficient reason that the testimony which supports his mission is greater and comes, of necessity, from a higher source. Man, with all his boasted stores of knowledge, cannot testify as to the truth of a revelation from God. That high prerogative is reserved to God only. It is Jehovah, the Creator, who alone can reveal Himself or declare His will to man. His creature, man, of himself is not a competent witness in the premises, for is it not written by the highest authority that—"the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God—that the world, by its wisdom knows not God—that man at his best estate is altogether vanity." "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?"

It becomes, therefore, the function and the province of every human witness in such relations to God, not to presume to offer his testimony, but simply to deliver, on

God's testimony, the message with which he may be charged to his fellow-man. He must stand up before his fellow-men as the mouth-piece of Jehovah, to utter His words and not his own. Hence, the prophets, God's messengers and witnesses to mankind, were inspired, and always say, "Thus saith the Lord;" and the Great Teacher and his witnesses say, "Thus it is written." That the delivery of these messages from God to man might be authenticated, the messengers were supplied with credentials, such as miracles, gifts of tongues, the power to heal the sick and raise the dead, etc. Illustrations of this fact are found in the Bible history of these witnesses for God, who, duly accredited and attested in their divine mission, found ready credence by all of good and honest hearts to whom they delivered their testimony.

It may seem to some a harmless error, an innocent mistake, to believe in the immortal soul theory and eternal torment dogma of pagan mythology. Such a conclusion is the result of a very superficial survey of the doctrine, when developed into its effects and its consequences. Brief reflection and a little knowledge of the nature and tendencies of the various religious systems extant, will suffice to show that it is to this fruitful source—as to a Pandora's box of evils—we are to refer the various forms of error in religious creeds and practice, and the innumerable jarring sects that chequer the map of "Christendom"—evils everywhere condemned in Scripture, which reveals the "one Lord—one Faith—and one Baptism," and enjoins the unity of God's servants

in one body or church, while it denounces sects and divisions as "heresies," not to be tolerated. Nor will it escape the intelligent observer that these divisions and controversies arise not indeed out of an honest difference as to what the Bible teaches, but more frequently from contentions as to doctrine and dogma derived from these pernicious theories pursued outside of the Bible, and from a desire to be "wise above what is written."

To substitute our own or other men's traditions and inventions for God's Word, even when professing to receive and accept it as our guide, is logically to deny and reject it. Immortal soulism and the eternal torment theory are, as we have said, altogether of Pagan origin and growth. Let us emphasize this statement by referring the reader to the mythology of the earliest historic periods, and to the writings of Socrates and Plato, and the philosophers, both Greek and Roman, of a later day. Let him at the same time take the Bible in his hands and search it from Genesis to Revelation, and in no part of the long record, will be found the least trace of these obnoxious tenets. We may safely challenge the most confident believer of these dogmas to produce one single passage of Scripture which either expressly or by logical implication, teaches this heathen creed. Within the lids of the Holy Book no such words as "immortal soul," "never-dying soul," "the immortality of the soul," "the eternal torment of the wicked," etc., are to be found, but everywhere in it the contrary is affirmed, and that theory is disproved and disowned.

Since these strictures have been in preparation, Mr. Ingersoll has furnished an apt illustration of the facile credulity with which men presume to confound these anomalies and absurdities of a Pagan superstition with the simple faith and pure religion of the Bible, thus attempting to hold the latter responsible for the former.

In a recent lecture delivered by him in Boston, he is thus reported in one of the city journals :

From the Boston Globe.

"If Christianity is true, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Longfellow are in hell to-night," was Mr. Ingersoll's greeting to his audience at the Boston theatre. "Calvin and Jonathan Edwards are in the other place, but give me hell in preference to such company." The audience cheered.

"If *Christianity* is true !" How unjust—how unblushingly, audaciously unfair ! When and where has "Christianity" revealed a hell of eternal flames and a Heaven of perennial joys above the skies, for any of our fallen race, at death or at any time, especially, too, *before* the resurrection and the judgment day ; seeing that the purified earth, and not Heaven, is to be the future abode of the redeemed ? Surely not in the Bible, for that describes Hades, the Bible hell, as the grave, the place of darkness, silence, and profound, unconscious sleep—"where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest"—in which "there is no work nor device, nor love, nor hatred, nor knowledge, nor wisdom." Nor can the Christianity of the Bible be held accountable for the childish, heathen superstition of the immortal soulists, that either Calvin, or Edwards, or Emerson, or Longfel-

low are in Heaven, seeing that it is the Christianity of the Bible that plainly and expressly declares that "no man hath ascended to Heaven but the Son of Man, who came down from Heaven"—that Christ declared just before His ascension to His Father's right hand in Heaven, in terms equally emphatic to his Apostles, "Whither I go ye cannot come." Has Mr. Ingersoll a private Bible, a new revelation that he presumes to contradict the Christian's creed by attributing to Christianity an oracle which it never delivered? This unscrupulous defamer of Christianity should have framed his exordium to the Boston audience differently. He ought, in candor, to have said, "If sectarian orthodoxy be true," etc. In that case we should have been obliged to accept his conclusion, and he would then have escaped the imputation of slandering Christianity, which, unhappily, now rests upon him. With Mr. Ingersoll, and with Judge Black as well, death, and the death-state, are insoluble mysteries. The "orthodox evangelical Christian," whatever that may mean, and the avowed infidel, stand upon the same platform, and as the blind cannot safely lead the blind we invite the leader to avoid their fate by considering in the light of Reason and Revelation, our only guides to true knowledge—the question:—

WHAT IS DEATH?

The frequent occurrence of death, and our daily, even hourly, liability to fall before the shafts of the grim and relentless destroyer, naturally begets within us a desire to know what death is—what is the death state—whether man is mortal or immortal—whether "death ends all," as the

infidel declares. If not then what becomes of us after death and before the resurrection.

It must be confessed that neither the preachers nor the philosophers of the day are agreed on these points, and hence we cannot trust ourselves blindly, as too many do, to their guidance. Is it not far safer and wiser, on so important and vital a question, to listen to the voice of reason and common sense; to that of experience and observation, and especially to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures? Every sensible and unprejudiced mind will approve this course.

1. Reason and common sense both teach us that when a man dies he is not alive in any sense, for death is the opposite of life; the death-state the very opposite of the life-state, and it is absurd and contradictory to say that a man can be dead and alive at the same time. We know that a man dies when he can no longer breathe the air which is his breath of life. We know this by actual observation and experiment, as when the criminal is hung, the pressure of the rope stops the breathing process, and the man dies and soon becomes a mass of dust. No one doubts or denies that in such a case the MAN dies—not his body only but all there is of him—as far as we know or can see, and we say without hesitation or fear of contradiction, such a man is dead. That is undoubtedly the testimony of reason and common sense.

2. We are not without some knowledge from the experience of others that death is an absolute and entire process, and that there is no life or consciousness after death until the resurrection—when, as we learn from the Bible, and from that source alone, the dead will live again. In cases of death by drowning, from epileptic and apoplectic fits, from a sudden blow on the head—where the breath has actually ceased, and men are dead and would remain so but for artificial remedies being applied to bring them to life—in some of these cases where men have lain for hours, and even days, in the death state, why is it that in not one solitary instance have these persons thus deprived of life ever had any experience or consciousness of life in that state? Can we deny that this evidence proves satisfactorily and beyond controversy that the common idea entertained by many and currently inculcated from the pulpit, that death is a living state—that men can be alive and conscious, and yet dead and unconscious at one and the same time, is wholly at war with experience and human testimony, as well as opposed to reason and common sense?

3. But when we come to the Bible statements upon the question, we are absolutely amazed at the prevalence of the belief, even among conscientious religious people, that the popular and orthodox doctrine of the dead being still alive and conscious, and in a knowing and wakeful state in Heaven or Hell, or Purgatory, as soon as the breath is out of the dead man's body, can be true.

Let us consider some of the Bible statements on the subject, which are so plain that he who runs may read, to show that such, far from being alive and conscious, in any other state or world after death, the testimony from both Testaments is all the other way:

"The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything. * * Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished forever. * * Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest."—Eccles. ch. ix.

In Job xiv it is written, "Man lieth down (in death) and riseth not; till the Heavens be no more they shall not wake, nor be raised out of their sleep." David, in the Psalms, says: "In death there is no remembrance of thee. In the grave (the receptacle of all the dead) who shall give thee thanks? He calls the death-state "the land of forgetfulness." He prays that God would bless him in the present life, adding, "before I go hence and be no more." Speaking of Christ's resurrection he saith, in Psalms xvi, "Thou wilt not leave his soul in Hell," (the grave, the death-state), etc., showing that after his death on the cross it was in that state.

In Dan. xii death is called a sleep. "Many of them (not their bodies), that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," (at the resurrection.)

These citations, with Psalms vi, xc, xxxvii, and many other passages, may suffice from the Old Testament.

Opening the New Testament, we find the testimony even more conclusive, if possible. When our Lord spoke to his disciples of the death of Lazarus, he said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." See John xi. Are men conscious when sound asleep? Can they know what is passing when they are asleep? Would the testimony of a witness be received in any court as to transactions which occurred while he was asleep? If Lazarus were alive and conscious, and in Heaven, (as our preachers now tell us all the righteous who die are), why did not Lazarus give and leave some record of what he

saw and heard during the four days of his conscious visit and sojourn in Heaven? Yet not one hint is given in the narrative of his having any such experience.

In John v the Savior saith: "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice and shall come forth," (not all that are in Heaven and Hell.) So, too, the Apostle Paul consoles the Thessalonians, I Thess. ch. iv, saying: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, (dead), that ye sorrow not," etc., adding, "them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him," at his coming and at the resurrection, and not till then.

Again, in I Corin. xv, throughout, the same Apostle plainly lays down and proves the proposition that the resurrection is the only hope of the Christian for future life; that "if there be no resurrection of the dead, the dead in Christ are perished," and we may "eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," a position utterly at war with a separate state of disembodied life and happiness, whether the dead are raised or not.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Lest the charge be made that we purposely suppress other Bible texts that teach the opposite conclusion, I briefly pass in review the several passages that are supposed to militate against the above position.

1. The promise made by our Lord to the penitent thief, that he should "be with Him in paradise." Luke xxiii, 39-44. In interpreting this colloquy it should be remembered that the answer was in reply to the petition of the robber. That petition was, "Lord, remember me when thou *comest* (not when thou *goest*) into thy Kingdom." It had reference to Christ's coming again to the

earth and not to His going away from it. The penitent was a believer in Christ's return and desired to be remembered by Him when He came to establish His Kingdom over Israel, and to reign on earth according to the predictions of the Master Himself, and in verification of Pilate's superscription, in three languages, over the head of the Son of God, "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." The whole context and all the facts and surroundings of the scene forbid any other conclusion. Paradise was not in Heaven, but on earth. It was situated in the delta of two well known rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, in Assyria. Were not Adam and Eve in Paradise? When Christ returns from the right hand of God to establish His Kingdom and reign on earth, Paradise will be restored to His ransomed people, among whom, according to this promise to him, on that day, the pardoned robber—raised from the dead—will appear and be "remembered." Again, let us observe that on the third day after His own death, the Lord said to Mary, "Touch (rather *seize*) me not for I am not yet ascended to my Father." If on the *third* day after he had *not* Himself ascended to His Father in Heaven, how can we maintain that the robber was with Him in Heaven or Paradise on that very day! In point of fact, as we learn in Acts, (chap. i,) He remained on earth after His death and resurrection "forty days" before His ascension. The mispunctuation of the Savior's language has contributed to the blunder of "orthodoxy" in its interpretation of this passage. If the comma be placed where it belongs according to the best critics, *after* the word "to-day" and

not before it, the real sense of the words appears: "Verily I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

2. Equally illogical and unsatisfactory are the attempts to bolster up the tottering theology of the pious dead going directly to Heaven, as soon as the vital air no longer animates the living being, based on the cases of Lazarus and the Rich man, and Moses and Elias appearing in the Transfiguration scene. Our limited space forbids enlargement on this supposed adverse testimony. It is only necessary to remark that, duly considered, *it* affords no more countenance to the orthodox faith (credulity) than the crucified robber's case. The first—Lazarus and the Rich man—is embodied in a parable, which is a fictitious narrative, designed, like Æsop's Fables, always and only, not to *prove*, but to *illustrate*, some moral truth or lesson. The narrative of facts and incidents introduced constitutes only the dress of the story, and is not to be taken literally. Hence it is absurd to attempt to *prove* a fact or a doctrine by relating a fable. We look for the point or object of the illustration employed, and in this case, as the context shows, that point was *not* the state of the dead, but the different destiny in the future life of the righteous poor man, (Lazarus), and the rich sensualist, (Dives). The intelligent reader sees, too, that the scene represents the actors as being substantial, physical beings, having eyes and tongues and bodies. They were *not* the ærial ghosts, disembodied souls or floating spirits of dead men, according to the orthodox school, and hence, if we accept the literal con-

struction, such testimony can prove nothing in support of the Pagan orthodoxy.

As to the appearance of Moses and Elias in the transfiguration scene, we know that Elijah did not die, but was translated and so his presence would prove nothing as to the death-state, upon which he had never entered, and as it is written of Moses that "the Lord buried him," his case becomes exceptional, and is not available for proof. Besides he may have been raised from the dead for this special occasion. Matthew's narrative of the event, ch. xvii, 9, speaks of it as a "vision," something unreal, in the nature of a trance or dream, and hence, not necessarily a physical occurrence, but sufficiently distinct and impressive to represent to the minds of the apostles a picture of his kingdom; and of his own appearance and that of Moses and Elias when he should come in his glory.

Thus we see on what a slender foundation—on what scant ground—these cherished dogmas of heathen mythology stand at last. Yet robed in the deceptive livery of *orthodoxy* they beguile honest but ignorant people, and pass unchallenged with Mr. Ingersoll and his allies, under the usurped name of Christianity.

Confessedly in darkness as to the constitution of man in life, and his state in death, neither Mr. Ingersoll nor Judge Black can solve the great problem of humanity. Neither of them seeks light from the only source whence it is to be derived. The first rejects the Bible light altogether, and the other, in adopting the Platonic theory as a guide, obscures his vision, and cannot discern the true

light. Yet nothing is more simple and easy of apprehension than the Mosaic narrative of the creation, constitution and destiny of man. Here we have the question of the "whence" and the "whither," fully answered. As to *whence* he comes, the answer is, "from the dust of the earth," and as to the *whither* he goes, we read, "dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." It reveals to us what otherwise we should never have discovered, that "God formed man from the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." His continued life was made to depend on his observance of the Creator's law. This simple sentence tells the whole story. From these premises we argue logically the following conclusions :

I. That man, being in his creation organized dust, was, before the in-breathing of the breath of life, mere inert matter—had no more life than the dust of which he was formed. But when this dust organism was set in motion, animated by the breath of life from God, he became "a living soul," not however an immortal soul, nor possessed of or inhabited by an immortal soul neither "in the head nor the heart," nor the lungs, nor the "grey matter of the brain," according to the fanciful theory of the physiologists and philosophers, but simply a living soul, or being, as we see him now, liable to death.

II. As he had access to all the fruits of the garden, including the tree of life, and excepting only that of the knowledge of good and evil, which was forbidden, he continued to live until his transgression, which entailed upon

him the prescribed penalty, death, and we see it literally fulfilled to this day.

III. That, from that moment becoming mortal, he paid himself, and his posterity after him, pays to this hour that penalty, Death, which ends the Adamic life—the only life he had—and remands him again to the dust of the ground.

IV. That Adam lived and his descendants yet live under this death sentence, which in their case is coëtaneous with their birth, the execution of the sentence being, however, suspended until he reaches the goal of life; then “the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit (or breath of life) returns unto God who gave it.”) Eccles. xii, 7.) Thus man realizes and proves in his own person that the “wages of sin is death”—*not* eternal life in misery.

Now who can discover in this plain narrative any hint, even the faintest intimation, of immortality, or even of any future life to man?—any threat of future pain or pleasure in the death state?

To that future life our right and title is derived from another source—the second Adam; as it is written, “The first man, Adam, was made a living soul. The last Adam was made a quickening (life-giving) spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural (animal), and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy—the second man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy and as is the Heavenly such shall

they also be that are Heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly."

There is indeed not only no immortality out of Christ, but absolutely no future life for any of our race, except according to His sovereign will and pleasure. It is He who "holds the keys of death and hell (the grave). He opens and no man shuts. He shuts and no man opens." He says of Himself, "I am the resurrection and the life." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." It is His voice that is to wake the sleeping dead. Hear His words: "The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves (not in Heaven, or Hell, or Purgatory), shall hear His voice and shall come forth. They that have done good unto the resurrection of *life* and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," (condemnation.) How justly and wisely He will employ this high prerogative trust which the Father hath confided to Him as the King, Judge and Ruler of all nations at His coming in His Kingdom, we may learn from what is written for our admonition unto whom the consummation of the ages is come. "He will render to every man according to his works. To those who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto those who, are contentious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace to every

man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile, for there is no respect of persons with God."

Truly, "Life and immortality are brought to life *through the Gospel*," and *not* by Thales, Socrates and Plato, who flourished many hundred years before Christ. In truth it was not until the Paganization of Christianity, in the days of Constantine, the Roman Emperor, and subsequently, that the Christian faith has become thoroughly corrupted by these interpolations of the Heathen Mythology, viz., immortal souls in men, the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of dead saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary, prayers to, and for the dead, future probation, the eternal torment of the wicked, etc., just as we see them at this day incorporated into the creeds and formulas of the Catholic and Protestant sects around us; all claiming to pass, unchallenged, as we have seen, under the name of *Christianity*. Fortunately such bold innovations,—such daring usurpations, and pernicious corruptions of the pure and simple Christian faith, have not wholly escaped profane history, whose pen has faithfully recorded them for our instruction and admonition. We have already recited in the body of this work some relevant testimony from the historians, Gibbon and Macaulay. We select from abundant similar material, brief extracts from more recent sources, in support of the statement we have made as to the Paganization of the Christian religion in modern times, by its professed friends, those who claim to be of the household of faith.

The late Dr. John W. Draper, of the University of New York, who cannot be claimed as a witness with a

bias toward the Christian faith, writes candidly in his "Conflict between Religion and Science," p. 39, as follows: "Christianity spread rapidly until Constantine, from motives of policy, adopted the new religion, after which, place, profit and power were ever in view of whomever joined the conquering sect. Crowds of worldly persons, who cared nothing about its religious ideas, became its warmest supporters. Pagans at heart, their influence was soon manifested in the *Paganization* of *Christianity* that forthwith ensued. The Emperor, no better than they, did nothing to check their proceedings, and did not personally conform to the rites of the Church, until the close of his evil life." Again: "It was clearly seen by many pious men, that religion was not accountable for the false position in which she was found, but that the misfortune was directly traceable, to the alliance she had contracted with Roman Paganism." Thus, after all, Dr. Draper, who held that Christianity was still merged in Paganism, should, in candor, have styled his book "The Conflict between Science and *Paganism*, in its Modern Development," and not between "Science and (the true) Religion."

Gibbon bears similar testimony. He says: "The Gnostics, (an early Christian sect), were distinguished as the most polite, the most learned, and the most wealthy of the Christian name, and that general appellation, which expresses a superiority of knowledge, was either assumed by their own pride, or ironically bestowed by the envy of their adversaries. * * * The Gnostics blended with the faith of Christ, many sublime but

obscure tenets, which they derived from Oriental Philosophy, and even from the religion of Zoroaster, concerning the eternity of matter, the existence of two principles, and the mysterious hierarchy of the invisible world. As soon as they launched out into that vast abyss, they delivered themselves to the guidance of a disordered imagination, and, as the paths of error are various and infinite, the Gnostics were imperceptibly divided into more than fifty particular sects," * * * "The writings of Cicero, represent in most lively colors, the ignorance, the errors and the uncertainty of the ancient philosophers, in regard to the immortality of the soul. * * *

It must be confessed, that in the sublime inquiry, their reason had been often guided by their imagination, and that their imagination had been prompted by their vanity. When they viewed, with complacency, the extent of their own mental powers—when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labors, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of death, and of the grave, they were unwilling to confound themselves with the beasts of the field, or to suppose that a being for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration. * * *

The general system of their Mythology, was unsupported by any solid proofs, and the wisest among the Pagans had already disclaimed its usurped authority. The description of the infernal

regions had been abandoned to the fancy of painters, and of poets, who peopled them with so many phantoms and monsters, who dispensed their rewards and punishments with so little equity, that a solemn truth—the hope of a future life, the most congenial to the human heart—was oppressed and disgraced by the absurd mixture of the wildest fictions. The doctrine of a future life was scarcely considered among the devout polytheists of Greece and Rome, as a fundamental article of faith. In the age of Cicero, and the first Cæsars, at the Bar, and in the senate of Rome, the ablest orators were not apprehensive of giving offence to their hearers, by exposing that doctrine as an idle and extravagant opinion, which was rejected with contempt by every man of a liberal education and understanding.”* Such was the natural consequence of their ignorance, or rejection of the heaven-born doctrine of the Resurrection of the dead, and their crude conjectures of future life, by the crooked conceit of the immortality of the soul, disembodied spirits, and eternal misery to the damned, conjectures so puerile and revolting, to the manly intellect of the better class among them, as to be discarded with pity or scorn.

I resist the temptation in support of our position of the entire mortality of man, to enter the wide field of popular hymnology—and glean thence the overwhelming proofs of the credulity and contradiction which characterize modern orthodox Churchism, as to man’s nature

*NOTE.—The Reader is referred to page 103, ante, for a striking quotation there cited from Gibbon, to the same purport.

and destiny. The field is too wide for full exploration. Two examples from favorite hymns must suffice. One reads thus :

First verse:—

“A charge to keep I have;
A God to glorify;
A never-dying soul to save,
And fit it for the sky.”

* * * *

Last verse:

“I can but perish if I go;
I am resolved to try,
For if I stay away, I know
I must forever die.”

What but rank Paganism, or blind credulity, could beguile sensible people into the belief that “a never dying soul must *forever die!*” Yet such is our religious orthodoxy. Another popular hymn reads:

“With thee we reign,
With thee we rise,
And kingdom gain
Beyond the skies.”

In plain denial of this Sky-kingdomania we oppose the clear testimony of the divine oracles : * * “Thou hast made us unto our God, Kings and Priests, and we *shall reign on the earth.*” Rev. v, 10.

CHRISTIANITY PAGANIZED.

This "Paganization of Christianity" is not confined to the creeds, confessions and theological symbols of the modern Gentile churches—claiming, too, to be "orthodox and evangelical"—but it infests likewise the schools and colleges, the learning, the poetry and literature of the age in which we live, and even glories in its shame, in adopting or imitating the absurd and puerile blunders of Paganism, exalting them by contrast over the truth and wisdom of the Divine religion. We do not stop to instance the obituary and funereal literature of the day, which, without hesitation, dispensing with the Bible teaching of the resurrection and a future judgment day, sends the dead to Heaven or Hell direct, and thus makes void the Word of God that they may keep their own traditions received from their Pagan saints, Plato, Epicurus, Zoroaster, Confucius, etc., for such is familiar knowledge to all our readers. How often do we hear or read, on such occasions, of the dead having "gone to that bourne *whence no traveler returns*,"—that they have fallen into "*the sleep which knows no waking*,"—that with them, as the learned John Quincy Adams declared, when stricken down by death in the nation's Capitol, "*And so this is the last of earth*"—sentiments and language entirely inconsistent with, and contradictory to, the Bible's oft-repeated declarations that "the dead shall

arise—that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust.”

To the same purport, and marked by the same practical disregard and denial of the truth of God’s word, certain of our own poets have contributed the resources of their genius and learning, following in the wake of Socrates and Plato—of the “Stoics and Epicureans,” whom St. Paul encountered at Athens, and refuted by preaching “Jesus and the resurrection,” to the utter confusion of their immortal soul theory. (Acts xvii.)

It is sad, though true, that our modern poets in civilized Europe and America, are mere copyists and imitators of Homer, Sophocles, etc., in Greece, and of Virgil and Ovid of Rome. Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Young, Addison, Byron and Moore, with Bryant, Poe, Whittier, Longfellow and Holmes, heedless of the voice of inspiration, are all content to adopt the creed of Platonism without inquiry or demur, and quietly to take their allotted places in the vast pantheon of the dark and blind superstition of Paganism. A few familiar extracts from our modern Platonists in poetry will serve to illustrate this position.

In Hamlet’s soliloquy, Shakespeare thus records his creed:

To die; to sleep;
To sleep; perchance to dream! Aye, there’s the rub.
For in that sleep of death, what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause. * * *
Who would fardels bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
But that the dread of something after death—

The undiscovered country from whose bourn
 No traveler returns—puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
 Than fly to others that we know not of.
 Thus conscience does make cowards of us all.”

Here there is no light above the tomb—no hope of escape from the grave, the common prison-house of humanity ; no promise of return from the “undiscovered country” whose bourne none have explored, but only the conscious “dread of something after death, which makes cowards of us all.” What advantage, then, had the Noble Dane, in a Christian land, over the learned Pagan who worshipped at the shrine of the “unknown God” in Athens? Thus we see that even Shakespeare in the wide sweep of his almost universal knowledge, had succumbed to the childish, though unquestioned and “orthodox,” theology of his times. If, like St. Paul, he had been enlightened by Divine Revelation, the gifted genius of Avon would like Paul, also “have put away childish things.”

In Addison’s Cato, the Roman suicide’s plea is thus urged :

* * * * *

“Eternity, thou pleasing, dreadful thought !
 Through what variety of untried being,
 Through what new scenes and changes must we pass.
 The wide unbounded prospect lies before me ;
 But shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it.
 * * Here will I hold. * * *
 Thus am I doubly armed ; my death and life,
 My bane and antidote, are both before me.
 This, * in a moment, brings me to an end ;
 But this† informs me I shall never die.

*The Dagger.

†Plato’s Treatise.

The soul, secured in her existence, smiles
 At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.
 The Stars shall fade away, the Sun himself
 Grow dim with age, and Nature sink in years,
 But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,
 Unhurt amidst the wars of elements,
 The wreck of matter, and the crash of worlds."

Very practical, very orthodox and very sublime—*nonsense*—unworthy of what has been called the Augustan age of English letters—the palmy day of the Reformed Religion!

Young, in his "Night Thoughts," thus describes man:

* * * * *

Distinguished link in being's endless chain!
 Midway from nothing to the Deity!
 A beam ethereal, sullied and absorpt,
 Though sullied and dishonored, still divine,
 Dim miniature of greatness absolute;
 An heir of glory, a frail child of dust,
 Helpless, immortal! Insect infinite!
 A worm! A God! I tremble at myself,
 And in myself am lost. At home a stranger
 Thought wanders up and down, surprised, aghast,
 And wondering at her own. How reason reels!
 Oh what a miracle to man is man!
 Triumphantly distressed, what joy, what dread!
 Alternately transported and alarmed.
 What can pursue my life, or what destroy?
 An angel's arm can't snatch me from the grave—
 Legions of angels can't confine me there."

He fitly closes this tortured paradox, long drawn out, with the masterful contradiction:

"Death gives us more than was in Eden lost—
The King of Terrors is the Prince of Peace!"

Christianity, in its modern perversion, is the ancient Paganism in a new dress, baptized with a new nomen-

elature. Its founders and professors have substituted God for Jupiter, Heaven for Elysium, Hell for Tartarus, Satan for Pluto, and immortal-soulism for the resurrection, and, like the ancient idolators, they erect temples and build statues, monuments and memorial churches and windows, to their Gentile saints, heroes and poets, whose crimes in some instances, rather than their virtues, have given them a bad eminence among their fellows. Pope, one of their great poets, has recognized this modern Paganistic equality, and communism of the Godhead, in his "Universal Prayer," which is applauded by common consent as both orthodox and beautiful:

"Father of all, in every age,
In every clime adored,
By saint, by savage and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord."

And, as if deliberately ignoring, if not discarding, God's revelation of Himself, the same Agnostic poet writes, in his essay on Man.

"Know then thyself; *presume not God to scan,*
The proper study of mankind is man."

God's word offers little inducement to man to study himself. Self-knowledge, chastened and guided by Divine inspiration, begets within us the humility, and self-abasement, which is the first step toward true wisdom and manliness; otherwise it is delusive, and becomes the source, and spring of self-esteem, pride and vanity. The Divine Oracles admonish us, that, "Man at his best estate is altogether vanity," and that it is "not in man that

walketh, to direct his steps." Such admonitions offer us little inducement to copy from a model so defective.

"Know then thyself"—a heathen precept—is naturally enough followed by, "Presume not God to scan"—a lesson of modern agnosticism, in broad contrast, with the wisdom which comes down from above, that commands : "*Acquaint thyself with God.*" "Thus saith the Lord, "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might. Let not the rich man glory in his riches, but let him that glorieth, glory in this, that *he understandeth and knoweth me*, that I am the Lord, which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth, for in these things, I delight, saith the Lord." Again; "This is life eternal, *To know thee*, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

Pope's agnosticism, is only paralleled by Plato's pantheism. In the multitude of Heathen Divinities, unable to decide, as to the true one, both bow down, with equal reverence, before the Athenian altar dedicated "*to the Unknown God!*"

Is not the precept equally absurd which declares : "*The proper study of mankind is man?*" Without a true knowledge of man's origin, constitution, and destiny, which our theologians and philosophers, confess they do not possess, how can they profitably "study man?" As man is himself a creature—the off-spring of God—we can only intelligently comprehend him, by tracing his parentage; in knowing the Creator, we best become

acquainted with the creature. We know the stream by ascending to its fountain. Even the profane Latin poet, wrote, "*Felix qui potuit cognoscere causas rerum.*"* Hence the English poet should have written: "The proper study of mankind is *God*."

Here is another gem from the same tawdry crown of a spurious religion—from "*Christianity as it is*," in modern days. It is a scrap of fugitive poetical orthodoxy from the fervid but obfuscated fancy of Lord Lytton, author of "*Lucile*," etc. It is boldly entitled—"*There is no Death*:"

"There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some fairer shore;
And bright in Heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

* * * * *

There is no death! An angel form
Walks o'er the earth, with silent tread;
He bears our best loved things away,
And then we call them "dead!"

* * * * *

And when he sees a smile too bright,
Or heart too pure for taint or vice,
He bears them to that world of light,
To dwell in Paradise.

And ever near us, though unseen,
The dear, immortal spirits tread;
For them the boundless universe
Is life—they are not dead.

In view of the learned ignorance of these poetical interpreters of the new orthodoxy, we are bound to rec-

* Happy is he who is able to trace the causes of things.

ognize the logical consistency of their creed, in expunging the resurrection of the dead altogether, for if "there is no death," there can be no resurrection from the dead, and so that cardinal tenet of the Christian faith—which, as we have seen, is our only ground of hope for future life—is discarded and abandoned. How can such infidel reasoners—"turning away their ears from the truth unto fables," (immortal souls, etc.,)—hope to escape St. Paul's condemnation, in his great argument in I Corinth. xv, to-wit: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only, we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable. What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Our own Longfellow, in his *Psalm of Life* is equally deficient in the Bible Doctrine. It is thus he writes of man's constitution and destiny, even with God's word open to his inspection:

"Life is real, life is earnest,
And the grave is *not* its goal.
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not spoken of the soul."

In flat contradiction of the Word of God! For it was to man—to Adam—the "living soul," according to Moses and Saint Paul, that God spoke the words in Gen. ii, 7, Ib. iii, 19. Yet the poet spoiled by patristic lore—his gifted genius darkened by the thick veil of Pagan blindness and orthodox philosophy—is led to give utterance to the exact opposite of what the Divine Record declares. Thus, we see the natural fruit of adopting the

Pagan creed; yet men still presume to ask, "Is there any harm in believing in the truth-opposing dogma of an immortal soul in man?"

It is sad to see that modern literature as well as modern Christianity, the orthodox religion of the present day, is a compound of Platonism, Pantheism, and Paganism. It is the legitimate product of that wide-spread apostacy from the primitive faith declared by Christ and His apostles, and which they predicted. He said to the scoffing Jews, "How can you believe who seek honor one of another, and seek not that honor which comes from God only? I am come in my own name, and ye receive me not. If another shall come in his name, him ye will receive." How strikingly are these sayings fulfilled, and illustrated in our modern ecclesiasticism! How ardent and reckless the pursuit, in this age, of the honors, the applause and the wealth which are sought of worldly ambition! The honor which men seek from their fellows! How few those who seek and strive for that true honor which cometh from God only! The vast multitude of religionists, in this generation, are careless or faithless, as to receiving Christ in His own name, but readily accept those teachers who come in their name. The whole calendar of Romish saints and the great army of Protestant sects, rise up before us as so many witnesses of the truth of this prophecy. Look at the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Wesleyans, the Swedenborgians, etc., which complacently adopt the names of those whom they confess to be their "founders," while

the will and the word, even the name of Christ, are forgotten or ignored !

We cannot better close this imperfect review, of the ignorance and folly of the current creed of our future state, and show how daringly defiant, of the plain teaching of God's Word, is the orthodox belief than to insert, as the latest phase of the current theology on the state of man, after death, the following lines, published extensively, in the press of our country, without dissent or demur. Doubtless no one will deny that Socrates, Plato, Shakespeare, Carlyle and Emerson are *dead*. One would be laughed to scorn, who presumed to affirm the contrary, yet our religious guides, will assert continually, man can be dead, and yet alive, at one and the same time. All recognize life and death, to be exact opposites—that they cannot co-exist—that if a man is dead, he cannot be alive: Yet while admitting all this, men accept, with approval, the very opposite—the flat contradiction of their own admissions—as in the following poetical apotheosis of one of their demi-gods, entitled :

EMERSON.

The Transcendentalist;—he now transcends
The cloud of death to meet immortal friends.
The wise man of the West, the saintly sage—
The mystic bard, the Plato of the age,
Hath changed his habitation. Lo ! his ghost
Takes note authentic of the Unknown Coast.
He holds divine communion with the men
Who consecrate to wisdom tongue and pen.
Perchance his "clear, fine talk" may reconcile
Momentous discords with redeemed Carlyle;
Mayhap, in Soul's hospitable domain,

He hails the shade of voluble Montaigne;
 Or treads with reverential feet the road
 [A welcome guest] to Shakespeare's own abode
 'Tis apt he strays beneath celestial trees,
 In questions deep with genial Socrates.

Surely this is poetical transcendentalism *transcended*—“a vaulting (orthodox) ambition which o'erleaps itself and falls on t'other side.” To adopt a fairer fullness of statement than Mr. Ingersoll could afford to give at Boston, we may say, “If the poet be right, the poor ghastly “ghost” of Emerson, floating in chilly ether, its body mouldering in the grave and denied resurrection, has not even the temporary relief granted to the demons to enter the swine and perish in the sea, rather than be disembodied—a state of being most to be dreaded, according to the devils themselves; and yet to this unhappy condition the poet consigns his friends Socrates, Emerson & Co., forever.

In clear contradiction, of these fancy sketches of the immortality of man, and the final catastrophe of creation, we submit the testimony of God's Word. “As for man, his days are as grass; as the flower of the field, so he flourisheth, for the wind passeth over it, and it is gone.” “Thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, Return ye children of men” (to the dust), for, “Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” And as to the grand “wreck of matter,” etc., which is to rend and ruin man's dwelling place, it is only necessary to remind the intelligent reader, that that same faithful Word assures us that

“the earth *abideth forever*, and shall *never* be moved out of its place.”

Such are, in practical reality, the deplorable consequences of Paganizing the religion of the Bible?

Is it wonderful that, under the influence of such patent absurdities, Christianity as it is, in its present dress, of dogmatic theology, robed in the tattered garments of the old Pagan superstition, should be at first suspected, closely scrutinized, and at length boldly discarded, and that honest, and intelligent men, detecting the counterfeit, should abandon the ranks of a spurious orthodoxy, and easily lapse into absolute indifferentism, or fall into the open gulf of infidelity? Anciently, and in its original application, the term *orthodox*, meant sound in doctrine, tested by the Divine standard, but in its present use, it denotes, the prevalent popular creed, in any particular locality. Thus, Popery is orthodox in Rome, Episcopacy in England, Unitarianism in Boston, Presbyterianism in Princeton, Mormonism in Utah. The phrase has thus lost its original meaning. In its proper and better use, history testifies, it was applied in the early Church to the pure truth of the Bible. Gibbon already quoted,* relates that “the ancient and popular doctrine, of the Millenium, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, etc., though it might not have been universally received, appears to have been *the reigning sentiment of the orthodox believers*, and seemed so well adapted to the desires and apprehensions of mankind, that it must have contributed in a very con-

* Ante p. 103.

siderable degree, to the progress of the Christian faith." Thus what was orthodox, with the early Christians, even according to profane history, is now heretical—a result attributable to *no other cause than the* modern corruption and Paganization of the pure faith of the gospel of Christ.

It is a deplorable reflection, with all well informed, and candid men, that these meretricious garments, of a long exploded Mythology, should have been picked up, and appropriated by the Theologians, and Philosophers of succeeding generations, and are at this day, ostentatiously paraded and emblazoned, in the gaze of the credulous multitude, as the resplendent robes of Christ's righteousness and the glistening regalia of "the King in His beauty."

Perhaps no modern author has exposed, more clearly and skilfully, the fallacies of the current orthodox faith, and developed in a more benignant spirit, the Bible doctrine of life and immortality, involving the constitution and destiny of our race, than the late Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, author of the celebrated treatise on Logic and other well known works. Although ignorant, or faithless of the kindred Bible doctrine of the "Gospel of the kingdom of God," and of Christ's literal Reign on earth, over all nations, and of the first and second resurrections of the dead, etc., he has shed a flood of Bible light, on the grand topic, of life and immortality in Christ, in his cautious and tentative treatment of the subject; and as it cannot be urged, that one so justly renowned for skill and power as a logician, is not to be

trusted as a reasoner, his arguments are the more weighty and valuable, and have never been answered. In his "*Life and Death*," and in "*Scripture Revelations of a Future Life*," Bishop Whately has examined and expounded the subject, with a perspicuity, and simplicity which leaves nothing to be desired. It is true, that he was preceded by one of his countrymen, the late *Dr. John Thomas* of London, who, as early as the year 1833, in his paper called, "*The Apostolic Advocate*," and subsequently, "*The Investigator*," first broached in the United States, whither he had migrated from England, the enquiry as to the immortality of the soul and the endless misery theory; and being, like Apollos, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, in public lectures and discussions, he boldly demanded the Bible proof, of the obnoxious dogmas. Subsequently he delivered lectures in Britain, and in the United States, on the subject, which were afterwards embodied in his learned and exhaustive work called, "*Elpis Israel*"—an exposition which passed through many editions in this country and in Great Britain, and was far in advance of the learning of that day and generation.

Under the influence of these revolutionizing ideas it is not surprising that thoughtful men, discerning the truth, have since risen up to complain of the modern wide departure from the right way—from the "old paths" of original faith, and that honest and conscientious enquirers in religion should at length have called a halt, and earnestly insisted on a return to first principles,

in order to discover and disinter the buried treasure of the long lost truth. These have come forth, though reluctantly, in late years, as so many witnesses to the predicted apostacy from the original faith, which was to give character to the ecclesiasticism of the latter days. In his address to the Elders of Ephesus, St. Paul, (Acts xx), gives this note of warning, saying: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you over-seers, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood. * * * * For I know this, that after my departing, shall grievous wolves enter among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, *to draw away the disciples after them.* Therefore watch and remember, that by the space of three years I cease not to warn every one, night and day, with tears; and now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

In further proof and illustration, Dr. Whately truly says: "It is certain that the words, Life, Eternal Life, Immortality, etc., are always applied in the Scriptures to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joys of their Lord. Life, as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean happy life, and that theirs will be a happy life we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are any-

where taught that the word Life does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so, indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a happy life, and a contradiction to speak of a miserable life, which we know is not the case according to the usage of any language. * *

“To the condition of the condemned the words Life or Immortality never are applied in Scripture. If, therefore, we suppose the hearers of Jesus and His apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible, in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean, if they taught nothing to the contrary, that the condemned were really and literally to be destroyed, and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness, for they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as forfeiting life, as, for instance, ‘Ye will not come to me that ye may have life,’—‘He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life,’ and again, ‘perdition,’ ‘death,’ ‘destruction,’ are employed in numerous passages to express their doom.”

The great John Locke in his *“Reasonableness of Christianity,”* says—“By death some men understand endless torments in Hell-fire, but it seems a strange way of understanding a law, which requires the plainest and directest words, that by death, should be meant eternal life in misery. Can any one be supposed to intend by a law which says “for felony thou shalt surely die”—not that he should lose his life, but be kept alive, in exquisite,

and perpetual torments? And would any one feel himself fairly dealt with that was so used?"

*THE GOSPEL—THE MEANS OF REGAINING
OUR LOST LIFE.*

In opposition to all this Pagan ignorance, superstition and folly, alike in its ancient and modern development which we see to be denounced and discarded by the word of God, the Christian if "a Scribe instructed in the kingdom of God," maintains and defends the Bible, as making known the only remedy for man's recovery from the fall, through the second Adam, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," who is the Resurrection, and the Life, and who only hath immortality, to bestow. Life only in Christ—though the great burden, of the Divine religion—is, however, an end to be attained, by the use of means, and the Gospel embraces the several steps by which the salvation it offers is secured. This redemption of the life man lost in Adam, is through faith and obedience, in the second Adam.

We have seen, that man lost God's favor, and his own life in Eden, by disbelief and consequent disobedience of the Divine law. This brought death into the world. In devising the means of man's recovery from this fall, infinite love and wisdom require him to retrace his steps—to return to the path of duty by belief and obedience to the same Law-giver. Hence the gospel, the new command, addressed to all the world, requires us to believe, and to obey the law, contained in the great commission, which Christ gave to His Apostles, and Disciples: "Go

ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth," (what you preach) "and is baptized, shall be saved." "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," etc.

Here we see all is harmony. Reason and Faith and Obedience all agree, and all conduce to an intelligent apprehension and submission to "the truth as it is in Jesus." The Bible invites us saying, "Come, let us *reason* together." It admonishes us that "without *faith* (of the gospel) it is impossible to please God," and it instructs us that, "to *obey* is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The command to be baptized ("immersed," honestly translated), in the name of the Lord Jesus, is the test of our loyalty and obedience to God's law. Like the command to the first man in Eden, not to eat of the forbidden fruit, it was in itself, an indifferent action; but its supreme importance arose from its being a divine command. So the new command delivered to us through the second Adam—baptism—derives its value to us from its being a Divine Law, and *must* therefore be obeyed.

In order to show the growing discontent with the current religious faith, we cite in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review* a very striking paper entitled, "*The Lord's Prayer and the Church*," embodying a correspondence between the eminent art critic, *John Ruskin*, D. C. L., and Mr. Malleeson, a clergyman of the Established Church. In these letters, Mr. Ruskin, widely known in the literary world, and a layman in the Anglican Church, pro-

pounds certain strictures, doubts, etc., in respect to the church expoundings of the Bible text, and indulges in quite free, but fair, criticisms which impeach the general worth of orthodox scriptural interpretations. These he finds very unsatisfactory, notably so in respect to the Lord's Prayer and the Gospel, and demands some method of improved construction. Mr. Ruskin says in Letter III :

"Can this Gospel of Christ be put into such plain words and short terms as that a plain man may understand it, and, if so, would it not be in a quite primal sense, desirable that it should be so, rather than left to be gathered out of the Thirty-nine Articles, etc." And again, in Letter IV, "Might not such definition, acceptable to the entire body of the Church of Christ, be arrived at by merely explaining in their completeness and life the terms of the Lord's Prayer, the first words taught to children all over the Christian world."

Canon Farrar, too, writes: a book to answer the question, "*Does Death end all?*"

In his "*New Republic*," William H. Mallock—the widely known author graphically convenes for discussion and for better light, the leading spirits in religion, literature, science and art, in England, to discover the problem of life and devise the remedy for the solution of its mysteries.

In our own country, Dr. Bellows discloses his apprehension of having lost his way, in his work, "A Re-Statement of Christian Doctrine." Dr. Ewer publishes his misgivings, whilst discarding Popery, in his enquiry: "*Is*

Protestantism a Failure?" an enquiry which the *New York Herald* considerably enlarges by opening its ample columns to the discussion of the startling question: "*Is Christianity a Failure?*"

A new phase of this burning desire for more light appears to us in A. Wilford Hall's "*Problem of Human Life, Here and Hereafter*," a volume of 500 pages, with a title most pregnant and suggestive, in which the learned author vigorously assaults the entrenched camp of Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, and the school of Helmholtz and the German scientists, and endeavors to wrest from their writings some unwilling proof, on scientific grounds, of the immortality of the soul as "the only possible hope of knowing more of the mysteries of the universe than is afforded by our present brief and circumscribed life". In this full and learned work, on the ample topic of "*The Problem of Human Life, Here and Hereafter*," the author, never discovers or suspects the least trace of the *only* true foundation of future life, namely, the grand, sublime, Bible doctrine of *the Resurrection of the Dead*—an affecting illustration of the little value of "science, falsely so-called," in such discussions.

It was doubtless the perception of these "shadows, clouds and darkness," which rest upon our future prospects that served to extort from Matthew Arnold, in his "*God and the Bible*," this remarkable confession: "At the present moment two things about the Christian Religion must surely be clear to any body with eyes in his

head. *One is that men cannot do without it; the other that they cannot do with it AS IT IS.*"

Such imposing testimony, from competent and trustworthy witnesses, converging like so many rays of light, from a thousand stars, cannot fail to produce the conviction, on candid minds, that it is quite time to *pause*, and seriously to ask, if in "these times of the Gentiles," as in the closing days of the Jewish age, *Christ* is not rejected in the House of His friends by those, who yet claim to wear His name, and that, "Lords many and Gods many" have usurped His place in their affection and worship. "*Not this man but Barabbas*" is no longer the cry of the scoffing Jews alone, who rejected Him on Calvary. It is Himself who says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not into the sheep-fold by the door but *climbeth up some other way*, the same is a thief and a robber."

Religion "*as it is*" has truly ceased to be what Christianity was, and should be, as it came to us from its Divine Founder. In place of the Paganized Counterfeit, we must reënthrone its primitive purity and simplicity. Is it wonderful, in view of this corruption of the Bible Religion—this predicted, wide-spread "falling away," (apostacy)—Acts xx, 30. I. Thess., ii, 3.—this "departure from the faith,"—I Tim., iv, 1—"having their ears turned from the truth, unto fables," that a marked, and well known, declension of interest and confidence in religion, in Church attendance, and religious worship, in Europe and America, is one of the most striking facts

in modern history. We know, too, that Missions, and missionary efforts in Heathen lands, are so barren of success, and have declined so notably, that the Heathen advances, and the Missionary recedes before him, and surrenders the field, to the desolate reign of darkness and superstition. Even in the so called "Christian World" of Europe and America, the statistics shew that the world and its corruptions, and temptations, have fatally ensnared the Church, so that honest and earnest men complain with reason, that it is the world that is converting the Church, and not the Church, that converts the world.

Mathew Arnold truly says, "Men cannot do without Christianity," for it is a natural need of fallen humanity. An able writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* has well said :

"Notwithstanding all philosophy, man is born to believe, to reverence and adore, as well as to think and feel. There would be neither scope, nor depth, nor progress in human life, if the intellects of human beings were forever wrapped in the tight swaddling cloths which metaphysicians and analysts can prepare. The poetry of life is perpetually bursting out, and neither in the affairs of this world nor the next, can the spirit of a man be restricted from believing, and hoping, and imagining more than it either can see or know at present. Religion has been in all ages, races and climates, a universal instinct of mankind. It is the master-passion of the human race ; it has been the basis of laws, of governments, of customs and institutions ; it has torn and lacerated society in all its forms ; it has been the curse and consolation of mankind as it has been false or true. We may denounce its particular manifestations, but that the spirit of man cleaves to the world to come is as true as that he stands erect in this world.

THE EARLY CHURCH CREEDS.

In this somewhat ungracious, but necessary work of criticism and correction of popular errors in religion, it would be unjust not to recall the creditable fact, that some of the formal creeds, of modern denominations of Christendom, are less objectionable in doctrine than the current expoundings of them, by the clergy. It is to be regretted that the Churches are not always as Scripturally expository as the creed requires them to be. It is a notable illustration, of this observation, that the reformer, Luther, and his colleagues, were bolder and better in the beginning, than in the end of their career. In their dauntless opposition to the Romish Church, like the Galatians they "began, but did not run well." Having begun in the spirit, they speedily yielded to the flesh, and at length, made themselves transgressors by abandoning the faith they had received, in preaching doctrines which destroyed it.

In the early part of his career, Luther wrote in defence of his theses, in 1520: "I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself, and his faithful—such as that he is emperor of the world—king of Heaven and God upon earth—that *the soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions, to be found in the Roman dung-hill of decretals."

Bishop Patrick, and Bishop Jeremy Taylor—both quoted by Dr. Whately, bear similar testimony: The former said: "Many of the ancient fathers look upon the expulsion of Adam from Eden as a merciful dispen

sation—that man might *not* be perpetuated in a state of sin.” The latter writes, “Whatsoever had a beginning, can also have an ending, * * * God had prepared a tree in Paradise, to have supported Adam in his artificial immortality: immortality was *not* in his nature—but in the hands and parts; in the favor and superadditions of God.”

Archdeacon Blackburn said: “The more any man is convinced of the immortality of the soul, from the principles of Aristotle, or Des Cartes, the less will he concern himself about the gospel account of futurity,” adding, “All those fine spun notions of the immortality of the soul, and all the artificial deduction from that principle, teaching nothing but the art of blowing scholastic bubbles, will certainly go peaceably to their rest, with out the least detriment, either to sound learning or true religion.”

Bishop Tillotson in 1774, in his Sermons, admits that the immortality of the soul is rather supposed—or taken for granted—than expressly revealed in the Bible. Timothy Dwight, D. D., L. L. D., once President of Yale College, in Sermons, Vol. I, p. 163, says: “Whatever has been created, can certainly be annihilated, by the power which created it—the continuance of the soul, must therefore depend absolutely on the will of God. But that will can never be known by His creatures, unless He is pleased to disclose it. Without Revelation therefore, the immortality of the soul must be entirely uncertain.”

This declension was due, in large part, no doubt, to the

multitude of errors the Reformers detected in the Romish Church, and to the brief time afforded, in the midst of such active contention, to expose and rebuke them. Luther and his colleagues manfully defended the great cardinal tenets of salvation by faith and not by works, either of the Jewish or Papal law. They contended for the right of private or individual judgment in matters of conscience, and for the paramount authority of the Word of God, and its free circulation. Beyond these they did not go. They did not seem to apprehend the meaning and significance of the Gospel—did not discern its connection with the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and his kingdom and millennial reign on earth, over all nations, with the immortalized saints as associate Kings and Rulers with him. They seem to have adhered to the Papistical dogma of Purgatory or Paradise, or of the dead going to Heaven or Hell at death, thus practically dispensing with the resurrection and judgment day; and they did not question the pagan theory of an eternity of torments to the wicked in the burning flames of hell, as a vital point of Christian doctrine. Although they accomplished a great work in relaxing the shackles with which the Romish Priesthood had tightly fettered the human mind in ignorance and fear, they left it in bondage still to many serious religious errors, both of doctrine and practice, from which the wonderful progress of discovery in other departments of knowledge, has not yet worked out emancipation, so that three succeeding centuries have not sufficed to fin-

ish the work the Reformers only begun. Hence the battle with error must again be renewed.

In a very recent work, entitled, "*Life Everlasting, What is it? Whence is it? Whose is it?*" by, J. H. Pettingell, A. M., a Congregational Minister, and author of *Platonism, vs. Christianity*, and other works, and just published in Philadelphia, we have a copious and exhaustive exposition of the Life Everlasting doctrine, in which, from sacred and patristic sources, the author proves his point conclusively, as to the entire mortality of man in his present state, and that there is no future immortality, no eternal life out of Christ. Consequently that the current faith, or, rather credulity of mankind, in respect to inherent immortality in all men, has no foundation in reason or Scripture. We regret that our limits forbid citations from this able work.

The occasion is appropriate to cite, in this connection, the very significant fact that, besides the profound silence of the Holy Scriptures, as to any doctrinal theory of immortal souls cherished, or countenanced by the apostles and Evangelists when they wrote, and left their testimony behind them, there is little trace of such Pagan inventions even in the early symbols and creeds of the first Protestants against the Roman usurpation. If we examine what is called, though without authority, *the Apostles creed*, which is endorsed and incorporated into the Protestant Episcopal Church of Great Britain, and the United States, we discover, that the immortal soul theory and the endless torment dogma, are both conspic-

uously absent, and, in lieu of them, we have expressly included and in logical sequence, "The Resurrection of the body (the dead) and the Life Everlasting." The same creed asserts of our blessed Lord, that He (*not His body only*) was crucified, dead and buried, that *He* descended into Hell (*Hades, the grave*), that *He* rose from the dead (*death-state*), the third day, etc., each, and every item of which is plainly inconsistent with the Pagan, but now orthodox theory that the dead, before resurrection and judgment are consigned to Paradise, Heaven or Hell, and are still living, conscious beings, and their destiny being already fixed, unalterably, Resurrection and Judgment, both future events according to the Bible, are rendered nugatory and void. To the same conclusion, we are irresistibly driven by the Thirty-nine articles of Religion, engrafted in the same Church creed, not one of which afford any basis for the Pagan dogma. The history of these articles, in their original, and amended form, is pertinent and instructive. We are indebted to the work of Dr. Pettingell, just referred to, for the following historical statement: He says under the head of "Modern Belief," p. 70-71. "Of all the great churches of this country, there is more freedom of opinion, certainly on this question, in the Episcopal Church, than in any other, and probably, more who hold to our view than in any other, and they hold it unmolested. There is nothing in their symbols of faith, their prayers or their liturgy that conflicts with it, but, on the other hand, much to favor it. The constant rec-

ognition, in their collects, and other forms, of Christ as the great source of Life, Eternal Life, the Life Everlasting is quite remarkable. * * *

It is interesting to note, that the confession of faith in this Church, now numbering Thirty-nine Articles, in the Anglican originally numbered forty-two; but in convocation under the presidency of Arch-Bishop Parker, in 1562 the two articles sustaining this papistical dogma, namely, the immortality of the soul, and the eternity of future suffering, were suppressed. Since then, the official authority of the Anglican Church has declared that the doctrine of eternal hell, is not an established dogma of the Church. No longer ago than 1864, the question was tried by the judicial committee, whether endless torment was a doctrine of the Church or not. In the case of *Wilson vs. Fendill* it was argued on both sides, by most able counsel, and after a mature deliberation, the Lord Chancellor gave judgement—the two Arch-bishops concurring—that it was not a doctrine of the Church, “for,” said he, “to affirm it to be so would be reinstating the expelled articles, which we have no power to do.”

While willingly concurring in much of the merit Dr. Pettingell awards to the creed of the Protestant Episcopal Church, it is due to candor and the cause of truth, to mark some note-worthy drawbacks to this eulogy, especially when we see the votaries of that creed, claiming for it the high paternity of the apostles of Christ. This symbol of faith, called, “The apostles’ Creed,” is quite as conspicuous for what *it omits* as for what *it*

recites, as fundamental for salvation. Only think of these inspired teachers of the doctrine of Christ, proceeding to formulate a creed for the disciples, and for all mankind, and for all Gentile times, and yet to give in it no statement—to make no mention even of the Gospel of the kingdom of God—of the coming of Christ to reign on earth, and over all nations, in great power and glory, of the Resurrection of the Saints to immortality, to share with their glorious Head in that exalted Destiny. Yet every Christian instructed in the truth, knows that it is these “things of the kingdom of God and of the name of Jesus Christ,” which constitute the subject matter of “the Gospel,” which is “the glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people,” and which, with baptism as the obedience of faith the Author and finisher of the faith commanded them to preach, and teach for Salvation among all nations! Mark xvi, 16–27. Acts viii, 12. Romans xvi, 25–27. Omissions so radical as these would seem to dispose effectually of the pretension that such was in reality the formula of the “apostles creed,” a conclusion also repudiated by the entire absence of all mention of it in the “Acts of the Apostles,” a History expressly preserved, to give a certain knowledge of what they said and did, for the instruction and guidance of the Saints who should come after them. The apostles were not creed-makers, Their office was to make known and defend, what God through Moses and the Prophets, and Christ and the apostles had already declared. Any other creed would have been *man-made*, and of no value;

for, if it contained only what was in the Word of God, it was useless and superfluous, and if it presumed to contradict, or to add to the Bible, it was pernicious and should be condemned.

It is a fearful truth, and of fearful import to man, that at the present day, the Bible is the least read, and the least understood book in our libraries. The cause of this is obvious. We have been taught to believe from childhood, by our teachers of religion, that the Bible is a hidden mystery—that no one can understand it—that indeed it was not intended to be understood, and therefore it is our duty to take second-hand, from our religious teachers, their version or interpretation of it, without demur or appeal. We do not read and examine for ourselves. Hence, we either neglect it altogether, or surrender ourselves blindly to the Church which means, of course, the Clergy, and—yet if like apostate Israel, we bring the Book to one that is learned—the clergyman—saying: “Read this I pray thee” he saith, “I cannot, for it is sealed,” and if the Book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying: “Read this I pray thee,” he saith, “I cannot, because, I am not learned. * *

* Wherefore the Lord saith, “Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips to honor me, but have removed their hearts far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men, therefore, * * * the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding

of their prudent men shall be hid." Isaiah xxix, 10-15.

Man naturally loses interest in any subject which he cannot comprehend, or which he believes to be incapable of solution.

It is earnestly to be hoped, that the reader may find in these pages some useful hints, and instructions from the Bible, which may enable him with ordinary diligence, to understand and appreciate God's Word, which in these "times of the Gentiles" is so confused and mystified by the traditions of men, as to be almost unintelligible to our perverted intellect.

The personal return of Christ to the earth, the establishment of His literal kingdom and reign with His saints, in Jerusalem, over the restored tribes of Israel, His dominion over all nations, as Lord and Governor of the nations upon earth, the consequent approaching downfall of all existing rule and authority over mankind, of all political, social, civil and ecclesiastical institutions among men, and the founding on their ruins, of the new empire under the Son of God and His associated saints, will fulfil the Divine promises delivered through Abraham, Moses, David, Daniel and the Prophets, and through our Lord and His apostles and saints. This consummation devoutly to be wished, is announced to us in its proclamation, "in order to the obedience of faith," in "the Gospel (good news) of the kingdom of God," and constitutes, when apprehended, the key to unlock the meaning of the Holy Book, and make the whole volume intelligible and plain to the simplest mind. The Book opens

with the recital of God's Creation of the Heavens and the earth—the present *Cosmos*. It closes with the promise of the creation of new Heavens and a new earth: "Behold I create new Heavens and a new earth—I make all things new." The present world, the mortal life of man, spans the intermediate space which separates these eras, and mankind await, in the life or death state, the Divine consummation of God's plans.

As the earth was the birth place of the first Adam and his race, so the same earth is the appointed birth-place, through the Resurrection, of the Second Adam and His saints, who are the Sons of God. Hence, the popular delusions, constituting the warp and woof of modernized Paganism, miscalled the "*Christian*" faith of our day, viz., the going to Heaven or a burning Hell at death, before resurrection, trial or judgement, and taking a final farewell of our native earth, altho' we are sternly confronted with the familiar fact, that we lie buried in her bosom, and without resurrection can never be released, these delusions, we repeat, derive no sanction from the Bible, and are but the false and pernicious legacies of a dark and gloomy superstition.

It is the judicious remark of Dr. Good in his Book of Nature, that it seems to have been an unaccountable habit of philosophers and theologians, at a very early day, to write and to speak of *matter* and the material world with contempt, as something base, or mean, unworthy of human regard or admiration, and hence, to charge an opponent, with being a *materialist*, was to fix on him an

odious accusation. He says truly there seems no ground for this unfounded prejudice, and he points to the fact that God, who is the author of both matter and spirit, pronounced all the works He had made, to be "good, very good." There seems no doubt that this absurd and pernicious prejudice, against things real and sensible, in our world, springs from our false religious education, and our ready adoption of the fanciful theories of life and death, held by the Heathen Philosophers, and now unhappily so generally current among us. Thus we have learned to spiritualize and to disembody our race, and even our world, and we utter as we have seen, the patent absurdities, "man never dies," "there is no death," and even "there is no matter." It is idle to reason gravely with such shallow sophists, but it seems enough to adopt the noble bard's wise policy of "answering a fool according to his folly." Byron wrote:

"When Bishop Berkeley said
 'There was no matter,'
 It was *no matter*
 What the Bishop said."

No wonder such childish fancies lead captive the judgment and make men easy victims of the phantasmagoria of Heathen Mythology.

Without arguing the immaterial issue, we may only say, that if there is no matter, there is no mind. There can be no smoke without fire, no life without organism. Imagine if you can, something before you perceptible to your senses, and yet without form, shape or substance. Even the subtle lightning reveals itself to us in its zig-

zag course, its dazzling vibrations, its vivid flash. The winds of Heaven are seen and felt, as they approach us, and by the effect they produce on our senses, but who ever saw an impalpable soul, or conversed with a disembodied spirit? All the evidence, all experience and all the analogies of nature and Scripture, are against the theory of ghosts or disembodied spirits. The ministering "Spirit" in Job (Chapter iv,) passed before Eliphaz, but was manifest in "image and voice" to his senses. When the Apostle Paul speaks of saints raised from the dead, they appear in "bodies," and are not disembodied. He says, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," and he proves in the same connection, (1st. Corinthians, xv,) that the saints will live forever, by reason of their being clothed upon, at the resurrection with *immortal bodies*, and not because they have immortal souls. He believed and taught the immortality of the body; the philosophers, on the contrary, held and taught the immortality of the soul. The second Adam, "the Lord, the Spirit," when He appeared to His disciples, after the resurrection, and after being clothed upon with immortality, having assumed His Spirit-nature, came nevertheless in a visible and tangible, though spiritual body. He said to Thomas: "Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side," etc.

THE LIFE PROBLEM.

We have already laid before the reader some evidence of the mistakes and errors which characterize the efforts

of the wisest philosophers, poets and sages of our own and former generations, to propound some satisfactory solution of the problem of man's creation, constitution and destiny.

The present *Kosmos* of creation has endured for nearly six thousand years, yet, man with all his progress in science and knowledge, has not been able to solve to his own or others satisfaction, the question which meets him on the threshold of existence and, unless he be taught of God, goes with him, unanswered to the grave. That question is, "WHAT IS LIFE, and WHENCE DO WE DERIVE IT?"

It would be unhandsome not to acknowledge the latest of these efforts in this direction, from a source entitled to high respect. Very recently, during the preparation of these pages, the writer has received from *Dr. Elliott Coues*, of Washington, "Professor of Anatomy in the National Medical College; Member of the Philosophical and Biological Societies of Washington; of the National Academy of Science, etc., etc., a pamphlet copy of his address entitled '*Biogen: a Speculation on the Origin and Nature of Life*, read before the Philosophical Society of Washington, May 6, 1882."

The learned and accomplished Scientist modestly styles his address, "a *Speculation*," which would have prepared us to treat it as a sort of tentative experiment, in an old but unsatisfactory field of inquiry, but he does not remit us to an inference. He plainly writes in the opening page of the address: "So far am I from

supposing, that the *Cruce* of the life-problem will be solved to-night, I do not hesitate to declare my belief that it has been resolved, neither by science nor by philosophy, and that it is insoluble in any royal water that can be compounded of to-day's science and philosophy."

In this work, the Professor surprises us by the intrepid boldness and freedom of his admissions of the poverty of science, and the vanity of philosophy to shed one ray of light on the insoluble mystery of life. I quote some passages from his candid pages, that the orthodox reader may see that the shifting sands of the desert are quite as firm and stable as the shattered foundation, on which his own cherished superstition rests.

On page 4, He says: "Neither science nor philosophy affords any proved basis for the most universal of human beliefs—the existence in man of an immortal soul," * * * * "So that if he desires that which most men desire (an explanation of the mystery of life) he must look elsewhere for the satisfaction of that desire."

"The scientific fact is—and by scientific fact I mean something that is positively known to be true—that life has never been ascertained to have any other origin than *in antecedent life*." p. 7.

"Life in the concrete is, of course the sum of the phenomena manifested by animated nature; of life in the abstract, of the essence or nature of that peculiar attribute of plants and animals, apart from its material manifestations *no knowledge whatever seems possible*, p.

13.—“I have thus far, purposely refrained from using the word, “*Spirit*.” But I cannot proceed with my idea of life, without introducing that term, to which I am aware much of the accredited *science* and *philosophy of the day* objects as being “*sound without sense*,” p. 15.

“*Our ignorance is absolute*. If it is ever overcome, no doubt we shall learn, what and where is the connection between mind and matter.” p. 21. “Let us not deceive ourselves with the giving new names to old things. Call them what you please—modern materialistic and atheistic notions about life, are every one of them disguises of the plain statement, that a self-created atom of matter lays an egg that will hatch—call this a monstrous absurdity—an instigation of the Devil, if you choose. I can call it neither science, nor philosophy, nor religion nor any thing that is learned, wise or true,” p. 25

Such is the candid testimony of an accomplished scholar, an accredited expounder and high priest, in the very sanctuary of modern science and philosophy, of the wonderful wisdom of the world, seen in the light of “reason’s torch,” and the open blaze of human learning. To such profound ignorance and darkness visible, Mr. Ingersoll, with Darwin, Huxley etc., would consign us, putting away the blessed light which radiates perpetually from the Sun of our mental firmament, the inspired word of God!

On seeing a newspaper sketch of this address, the writer contributed a notice of it to the *Washington Post*.*

*TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST:—The recent lecture before the Philosophical Society of Washington by Dr. Cones, on the “Possibilities of Protoplasm,”

This led Professor Coues to send him a printed copy.

which involved the origin and nature of life, suggests the reflection that it is conceded by the world of scientists and philosophers, that the true knowledge of the origin of life is as yet undiscovered, notwithstanding the wonderful progress in modern times, in all other departments of human knowledge.

Without stopping to trace out the cause of this phenomenal result, let the writer suggest, in the fewest and simplest words, and without further pursuit of the devious though beaten track of philosophical speculation, which has always hitherto misled explorers deplorably, that the mysterious secret so ardently sought is disclosed to us, in a field of investigation which the scientists never enter—namely, The Bible—The Word of God—where alone the vexed problem is solved. It is the Bible—God's revelation to man of his own origin, nature and destiny, that alone imparts this knowledge. It would be passing strange—more wonderful than a Divine miracle—that Our Creator should place this boon in our hands, to acquaint us with Himself and with ourselves, and to make known our relations and duties to Him, and yet fail to inform us of the source and nature of the life He gives us. For nearly 6,000 years this instruction has been supplied to our race. Like all other secrets disclosed to us, however, by revelation—which is but another name for true science, 'man's unfolding of God's book of nature'—it is too simple and obvious to receive credence from the learned scientist and proud philosopher. Yet it is written in the Bible account of the human race, stereotyped and enduring to the last recorded syllable of time—Genesis ii 7: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

The Philosophers, with all the resources of human learning and science at their command, have never improved on this definition of the origin and nature of life. Life, then, is the gift of God, bestowed on all breathing things through the medium of the breath of life, which includes the spirit of God, pervading and permeating the atmosphere which surrounds us. What Moses calls the "breath of life," Job, xxvii, 3, calls "the spirit of God in my nostrils," and in ch. xxxiii, 4, he says, "The spirit of God hath made me and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life."

To the same effect St. Paul taught the idolatrous Athenian philosophers, occupied with the same barren speculations which Professor Coues discusses. Speaking of God he says: "In Him we live and move and have our being." The Great Teacher sent from God, taught "God is spirit," and Jehovah saith of Himself, "Behold I fill Heaven and earth," and the Psalmist David says so himself and in adoring wonder, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into Heaven, thou art there; If I make my bed in hell (he grave) behold, thou art there; If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even thence shall thy hand lead me and thy right hand shall hold me." It is this universal, all pervasive, animating and vitalizing spirit that in parts life to man and all animated nature during life, and withdrawal of which at death from man no longer capable of breathing the breath or the spirit of life from God, consigns him to his native dust, from which he will emerge again by the Divine fiat, at the resurrection of the dead.

Now this reasoning and conclusion, may not be acceptable to the orthodox scientist or theologian. It may seem to you so odd and so far off the beaten track of popular credulity as to bar admission to even your broad and independent columns; nevertheless it is the truth, I humbly submit, which neither science nor theology can successfully combat.

The high position of the lecturer in the Scientific and Literary World, his official connection with the National Medical College, and with learned societies and academies of Science, etc., invest his utterances with a peculiar authority, with those who are accustomed to draw both instruction and inspiration from such sources. The accomplished and venerable Professor, *William B. Rogers*, very recently deceased—formerly of the Faculty of the University of Virginia, and among the foremost of the renowned *Savans* of our day, occupied the chair during the delivery of this address. We may therefore regard this latest as the best outgrowth and exposition of human science on the subject, in our country at least. Behold then the confessed weakness, the deplorable ignorance, the paltry outcome of the vain philosophy, and science falsely so called, which constitutes the present wisdom of the world in this department of human learning! When we open the word of God and hearken to the voice of inspiration, to the simple teachings of that “Spirit,” to which the Professor informs us with commendable candor, his colleagues “in accredited Science and Philosophy,” have the rashness to *object*, as being “sound without sense,” can we be surprised that the Holy Scriptures should warn us against such philosophy and science, “*falsely* so called?” It is this wisdom of the world (which “with God is foolishness”) that the candid scientist offers for our instruction and guidance in respect to life, its nature and issues! With him *Biogen* (the discovery of the origin and nature of life) is an admitted

failure. In his hands, it is the art of guessing—the sport of “speculation”—the Science of conjecture, the Philosophy of ignorance and vanity—the literature of mere agnosticism and as all its votaries are too wise to learn and the ethics of the professor forbid investigation in the light of “*the spirit*,” which is God’s revelation of the mystery, he must needs retire ingloriously and abashed from the field of enquiry.

With the theologian, the case is even worse. His professed mission is to make known “the things of the Spirit of God.” How does he fill it? By opening the Divine oracles and reverently rehearsing their testimony on the subject? No, but fearful of the silly cry of uttering “sound without sense,” he turns away from the true light and follows the blind leaders of the blind. Is it strange that he should also fall with them into the ditch?

But let us not fail in justice to Professor Coues. In the conclusion of his address he catches a glimpse of a rightful solution of his hard problem, which, if logically pursued, with his characteristic candor, will lead him from the dark labyrinth into the light of day. He says, page 25. “Whence emanated matter in the beginning is inscrutable. From no where, certainly, if not from the self conscious—self determining universal MIND which willed to so become manifest. Where to? Nowhere, certainly, if not to whence it came to complete the circle—symbol of infinity—Whose quadrature is unknown.”

Here we have God at last as the Source and Giver of life, which is imparted by His Spirit. Again, “the

vital principle I am bound to consider as the most direct and immediate natural manifestation we have of the great FIRST CAUSE and consequently to refer it at once far back of any such secondary cause, as a mechanical or chemical law. * * * Being absolutely beyond the scrutiny of the physical senses, it would scarcely appear to fall within the scope either of science or philosophy, and I doubt that human reason, unenlightened by revelation, can learn much about it, for that would be to find out God by taking thought."

"Since the retiring president of this society has declared that neither science nor philosophy affords any foundation or proof upon which any conscious mind may build hopes of that immortality of the soul (here he means future life) which is to that same mind, a necessary conditioning of existence, it is to be hoped, that science may yet discover facts enough, and philosophy find truth enough, to render that happy result possible; for until they do, they are together *obviously incompetent to deal with the life problem.*" p. 26.

In this condition of being persuaded that knowledge is impossible *whilst "unenlightened by revelation,"* the professor has at last found the key which unlocks the mysteries that enshroud the scientists in darkness and dismay. It is when "enlightened by revelation" only, that we see our way clear.

*LIFE IS NOT INHERENT, BUT EXTERNAL TO
MAN.*

It is the Spirit of God, the breath of the Almighty,

which gives *life* to man, according to the express terms of the revelation He has made to us. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul," thus man still lives; for the first act of the new born infant is to breathe the breath of life thro' its nostrils. His Spirit acting on organized dust, produces motion and manifests life, in all animals and plants. Ordinarily it imparts life only, on certain prescribed conditions. These require in men and animals, a certain antecedent structure of bones and flesh, such as are found to exist in the substance or body of the unborn child. It's life before birth is, we know *not* independent but derived from its mother, through whose breathing the child lives. This dependent embryotic life, drawn from its mother, is at birth exchanged for an independent existence derived direct from God, by inhaling the breath of life which embodying the Spirit of God, pervades, and permeates the world of air, and earth and fire and water which form in combination the elements of our animated existence. This breath, or Spirit of God fills all space, giving life or destroying it, at His Sovereign will or pleasure. It's source is not inherent in man as immortal soulists teach. It is, on the contrary, external to him and is the special gift of God to all born into the world; to endure until life is destroyed and succeeded by death, when the "dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it." Eccles. xii, 7.

This we submit to the puzzled scientist, is the Bible "*Biogen*." It has at least the merit of being short and

simple. How completely it corresponds with our observation and experience of the laws of life—how fully it harmonizes with the Word of inspiration ! It is the Bible that tells us, “In Him (God) we live and move and have our being,” that “He knoweth our frame,” that “He remembereth we are dust,” that “He is the God in whose hand our breath is, that “in His hand is the soul (life) of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind,” and finally that “all things are of God,” that “Without His Spirit was not anything made that was made,” that “in Him was Life, and the Life was (or become) the light of men.”

Such is the life we derive from our first parents, under the Adamic organization and constitution of things, and as he our Father, became. by the fall, corruptible and mortal—“of the earth, earthy”—we his offspring, partake of his fallen nature and inherit his mortal destiny. We thus ratify the law of our being, and fulfil, to the letter, the first penalty and the first prophecy of the Scripture ; *“Dust thou art and unto to dust shalt thou return.”*

Now if any should ask in view of our brief mortal life—“Is that all that remains? Does death end all?” We reply, in truth, “That is what we get from the first Adam, dissolution, decay and death, for he lived and died, like ourselves, “under the ministration of death,” and has no other or new life to bequeath to us.” Hence to answer the oldest of all questions, “If a man die shall he live again?” We turn from the first Adam and point, how gladly, to the Second Adam, not a living soul merely but

a life giving Spirit—not of the earth earthy—but the Lord from Heaven, the Lord, the Spirit, to Him in whom our life is hid, who is “our Life” and who says of Himself, “I am the Resurrection and the Life,” and immediately repairs to the grave of the dead Lazarus and there triumphantly proves and illustrates the truth and power of His words, by the resurrection of his friend from the death state.

We are taught in Holy Writ that “life and immortality are brought to light *thro’ the Gospel*,” and not by any other means; that “God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,” that “the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord,” that we are “to seek for immortality,” that, “God only hath immortality,” which He will impart to His faithful servants thro’ the Lord of Life, by the Resurrection at His coming, and in His kingdom, and that, in fine, “this is the record that God hath given to us, eternal life, and this life is in His Son; he that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.”

Here we see plainly that immortality is contingent and conditional, and is *not*, as taught in the Religion and Philosophy of these modern times, the natural birth-right and inheritance of all men. These conditions are that we should be in Christ, that we should be engrafted into the Second Adam, and become partakers of the Life and Immortality which He alone bestows at the resurrection

of the just, and which shall be brought unto us at the revelation (return) of Jesus Christ," from the Father's right hand. This process of being now incorporated into Christ is by faith in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, by the obedience of faith in baptism, and by a patient continuance, afterwards, in well doing in a new life of integrity in the sight of God and man. As our first life in Adam was lost by disbelief and disobedience to God's law, so our new immortal life will be secured to us, in the Second Adam, by belief and obedience to the law of God.

From such premises we are surely authorized to answer the question that man, placed under opportunities of knowledge, and consequently of responsibility, will live again in the Resurrection, thro' the power of Him who holds the keys of Death and the Grave, the righteous to have a new and immortal life bestowed on them with the glory, honor, and blessedness which belong to that happy era, and the ungodly to be judged and suffer a just retribution according to their deeds in this mortal life, not in endless misery, but whose *final* end is destruction in the second death. When that is finished, not having acquired any right or title to immortality, through Christ, they will remain forever in their native earth, a second death, which blots them out of the land of the living and removes them forever from a scene in which they could bear no useful or honorable part.

THE PREVALENT APOSTACY FROM THE TRUTH.

We are persuaded that many reasons in support of the

conclusions reached in this work will suggest themselves to the thoughtful and candid reader as he examines the proofs submitted. The Athenians to whom Paul preached (Acts xvii) the Gospel were as well instructed in the science and philosophy of the Schools as the *Savans* and the theologians of our own times. In fact our science (much of it falsely so called) is in the main the reproduction of their crude conjectures. Yet of so little real value were these acquisitions to them that when they heard St. Paul, preaching future life "through Jesus and the resurrection" they styled the doctrine "strange" and "new," and himself "a setter forth of strange gods." So now our philisophers and theologians though hearing the same doctrine that Paul preached, confidently boasting that they have the light of the Bible which the superstitious Athenians had not, are with so much less excuse to this day, almost if not quite as ignorant and faithless of the true ground of future life, by the means, and on the conditions the Gospel discloses, as their prototypes the Stoics and Epicureans of Athens.

The ancient theology of an immortal soul in man, by which and not by a resurrection, he is to live again is so firmly seated in the mind of the modern theologian, that he too is beguiled into the worship of the "Unknown God," and must be even now, at this late day, led by the Apostle's testimony and logic—if led at all—to recognize for the first time, the Being whom he ignorantly worships, tho' not called by that name. This sad but

truthful reflection affords proof of the depth and breadth of that apostacy from the Bible faith which the Savior and the Apostles foretold. See Matt. xxiv, 15. Acts xx, 29-33. I. Peter i, 1-4. I. Timothy iv 1-8. I. Thess. i, 1-13. Jude, iv, 10-20.

The Scriptures abound with these notes of warning as to the coming and well-nigh universal apostacy from the true faith, in the latter days of this Gentile, age and we read their fulfillment in modern and current history.

In this attempted defense of the Bible Religion against the infidel assailant, I have passed in review many, if not all, the seemingly considerate objections which skeptical foes are accustomed to urge against the Holy Book.

I would not, however, take final leave of a subject of such vast interest and importance, and pass by, unconsidered, a question—I will not call it an *objection*—which some very conscientious men have suggested and entertained in regard to one feature of the Divine plan of human creation and redemption. That question relates to the

ORIGIN AND USES OF EVIL.

“Why did not God make man incapable of sinning while he was pure and innocent in the garden of Eden? This would of necessity have prevented his fall and kept himself and his offspring always safe from the consequences which have followed from his disobedience.”

It is not denied that such an objection to the plan actually adopted, seems formidable, if not unanswerable, in the mouth and the mind of a believer in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul which claims, that if man lives at all he must of necessity, live forever. In that view of the subject, seeing that according to our observation and experience, the vast majority of our race reject or "neglect the great salvation" offered in the Gospel, and that as Revelation teaches us that, in the present *cosmos*, the few comparatively will be saved .it is objected that the scheme seems to work the loss of the many, and effects only the happiness of the few. A reasonable answer, will suggest itself to the reflecting mind, when we consider that we are scarcely competent, with present light, to resolve the question—for as the end is not yet, and without a special revelation concerning it, and with our finite faculties, we cannot see that end, and therefore cannot decide as yet, whether it will be good or ill. But God sees the end from the beginning, and is therefore by far the best judge of what is ultimately wisest and best; and has, undoubtedly, in adapting the means to that end, acted as to Him was wisest and best.

When, however, such men as Archbishop Whately in his "*Life and Death*," has ventured to maintain that we know not how to explain the existence of any evil at all in the world—when Canon Farrar, another high dignity in the Church of England, in order to escape the argument drawn from the predominance of evil, has writ-

ten his "*Eternal Hope*," to answer the question, "Does Death end All?" when W. H. Mallock, the gifted author and scholarly layman, lately of the Anglican Church, has, in deep anxiety to know the truth, written "*Is Life Worth Living?*" more recently, "*The New Republic*," in which he attempts to solve for his own, and other's satisfaction, the imposing questions of our present life and future prospects, we see how deeply the public mind of Britain is agitated on these grand themes. Nor, has our own country escaped the fever of similiar debates and discussions. We have from the American Press such works as *Elpis Israel*, an exposition of prophecy etc., in which the origin of sin and of evil is Scripturally considered—a work of great learning and research, already referred to, by the late John Thomas, M. D., an Anglo-American residing in the United States; Dr. Bledsoe's ponderous "*Theodicy*," Dr. Southall's, "*Recent Origin of Man*," Dr. Ewer's, "*Protestantism a Failure*," "*The Death of Death by an orthodox Layman*," (Colonel John M. Patton, of Virginia,) A. Wilford Hall's *Problem of Human Life—Here and Hereafter*," and more recently Dr. J. H. Pettingell's *The Life everlasting What is it? Whence is it? Whose is it?*" each agitating the cause, and uses of evil, in our world, and all springing from the same "Hill of Difficulty"—the supposed eternity of human life and sin—the writer may find some excuse for following, *haurd passubus æquis*,* and in brief space, such learned, and scholarly explorers.

* "With unequal steps."

An especial license to do so seems to arise from the consideration that some of these have been led to confess that the results they have obtained have not been, wholly satisfactory even to themselves.

With the Bible in our hands which, as we have seen, makes short work of immortal-soulism—the fruitful source of all these outside Scripture discussions and blunders,—we lay the axe at the root of the tree when we expose the flimsy sophism of man's inherent immortality, and point, as we do triumphantly, to that benign and blessed Book—the Bible—which acquaints us with God, restores us from the fall, and finally *immortalizes man*, through “Him who is the Resurrection and the Life.”

The chief difficulty in the pathway of these speculative explorers who cannot harmonize their theories of God's wisdom and goodness with man's highest happiness, arises from their failure properly to define and apprehend the terms of their propositions. They ask “why did not the Creator make man of such a constitution, that both sin and evil would have been impossible.” This obliges us *in limine* to ask; *What is sin? What is evil?* Unfortunately most readers regard them as similar—almost of the same import—and even use them interchangeably. But a little reflection will serve to correct this error. Now the Bible defines these terms for us. “Sin, saith the apostle John, “is the transgression of the law,” and evil, the opposite of good, is the penalty or “wages of sin.” Hence it is written : “The wages of sin is death.”

Thus we see one is the cause; the other the effect of transgression. If there were no law there would be no sin, and if no sin there would be no evil; but as long as sin exists, evil which is suffering, must exist also, to be used as a punishment—as a check and restraint on the prevalence of sin. If I put my fingers in the burning flame, I sin by the transgression of the law that the flame will burn me, and the pain I endure from the sin is its penalty which will tend to restrain me from repeating the transgression. I commit the sin and the Lawgiver inflicts the evil, *i. e.*, the pain as the consequence of the transgression. If I had not broken the law, I would not have committed the sin, and would not have suffered the evil. The Lawgiver was *not* the author and creator of the sin. The transgression was my own act, but the Lawgiver visits on the sin the prescribed evil and penalty, and thus becomes the author and inflictor of the punishment. Applying this simple illustration to God's dealings with man, on a larger scale, we learn that while God is indeed the creator of the evil which is the consequence of the sin, it is *man not God*, who is the author of the sin. Thus it logically appears that we may safely say "God is the author of that *evil*" but we cannot say, He is "the author of *sin*." He creates evil to punish and restrain sin. He says of Himself in Isaiah xlv, 7. "I form the light and I create darkness: I make peace and I *create evil*."

"*Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it.*" Amos iii, 6.

It is man's acts and not God's, that perpetuate evil in the present world. Man by his sin against God's laws, both in nature and in religion, is therefore responsible, and not God, for the sin and the evil which follow.

Let him cease from sinning, and God will cease from inflicting evil upon him. This benign end will yet be attained in the coming future. Let it not be said then that God should not have permitted Adam to be tempted, but should have made sin impossible,

Have these wise optimists gravely considered what would have been the consequences to Adam, and to themselves, his posterity, had their plan been adopted?

The first human pair, our primeval ancestors, being made incapable of sinning, would have been also ignorant and without experience of good and evil. They would have been equally unaquainted with right or wrong. Like the sagacious beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, they would have enjoyed that simple, inert, objectless existence, which plants and animals derive, at this day, from the air they breathe, the food they eat, the water they drink, the exercise that keeps them in health, and the rest and comfort that come from the gratification of merely physical, animal instincts. They would have differed from the inferior animals of creation, chiefly in their physical form and shape, ignorant alike of virtue and of vice, of the worth of wisdom, the pleasures of knowledge—the causes of evil—the uses of adversity; destitute of all knowledge of good and evil,

man would never have advanced beyond primeval helplessness.

He would have remained entirely void of character and of intelligence. Without the formative principle of knowledge—without the discipline of experience—without the inspiration of hope—being wholly negative in his nature, whatever fires of genius or of virtue might have slumbered undeveloped in his constitution, he must have continued forever under the dominion of blind instinct, and been always in abeyance of what might have been his better destiny.

Yet despite these obvious facts and conclusions, our critics assuming to be philosophers, have flippantly questioned the Divine Wisdom, and demand with an air of superior sagacity, why man was not made “incapable of sin and without experience of evil?”

Let us survey the scene for a moment, which on such a hypothesis, the human race and world would have presented. Education, science, art, literature would have been unknown. The car of human progress and improvement would not indeed have been checked in its career, for it would never have been set in motion. Noah would never have built the ark, nor Solomon the temple. Archimedes would never have asked for the fulcrum to overturn the world. The youthful conqueror, Alexander the Great, would never have wept so bitterly, that he had not another world to conquer. Homer would never have written the poem, which made seven cities contend for the honor of his birth. Diogenes would never have

been known by his *Tub*, for no cooper could have been found to construct such a residence for the eccentric philosopher. Columbus would never have discovered America, nor Bacon invented gunpowder, nor that other Bacon (Verulam,) have taught us philosophy, nor Newton shown us the principles of science, nor La Place given us his *Mechanique celeste* to reveal to us the starry heavens.

Steam would have been unknown—gold without value—printing and photography among the undiscovered arts—the telegraph impossible, and the telephone incredible.

History would have yielded us no chronicles; and the great names of our race, from Nimrod and Nebuchadnezzar to Washington and Napoleon, would have perished. Society would have been a vapid inanity, and the world a trackless wilderness. With the knowledge and experience acquired by the fall, we may boldly declare, that on such a basis of creation, human responsibility and human progress and development would have been alike impossible. Creation itself, with all its teeming wonders would have remained to us a puzzle and a blank—and *Man* have been the monarch of a grand, void, vast chaos. That such is not our present unhappy lot we owe to the Divine Benevolence in wisely over-ruling sin and evil in their consequences, and in arranging the system as it is, giving man full liberty and free agency, by which he acquires experience of good and evil, is subjected to trial and is enabled thereby to form a character worthy of the Divine praise, so that those of his race who may have

stood the test of loyalty and been approved, by choosing the good and refusing the evil, may be ultimately exalted to the Divine nature.

If the critics wish to see a world created and governed on their theory of "no sin and no evil," let them behold the floral, plant, and animal kingdom. Are they not devised and arranged on that theory? Are they not innocent of sin and ignorant of evil? Would our fastidious critics change places with them? Would they prefer to be "like dumb cattle, driven" by instinct, rather than to walk voluntarily by the light of reason, experience and revelation? We hardly think so, in view of what has been already submitted.

To make our answer even more conclusive, we add another reflection. The inherent eternity of future life to all men being out of the question, it is safe to maintain from the testimony of human experience and observation, that under the existing *cosmos*, human life is in itself a blessing, and not an evil. Man gains by his creation a joyful life, although born and living under the constitution of sin, and subject to the evils that follow.

Surveying the whole creation, and human existence in the present life, we see that men as a general rule, enjoy more than they suffer. Enjoyment is the rule and suffering the exception. Hence, we logically accept the conclusion, that it was wisest and best in the Great Architect, seeing the end from the beginning, to create man, and to subject the race to trial and to the consequences of the fall. Such an arrangement, when consummated and in its end

displayed, will be found to reflect the glory of God, and the good of man. Doubtless it was in view of this grand consummation, that amid the multitude of the Heavenly host, who crowded the gallery of the heavens, and beheld the creation scene, the Cherubim and Seraphim veiled their faces in adoring admiration, "the morning stars sang together and all the Sons of God shouted for joy."

By this wise and gracious plan—comprehensively revealed to us as the means of recovery from the fall, in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God—the ways of God toward man will be justified—His laws will have been vindicated—mercy and judgment will have been harmonized—the Gospel of mercy, love and salvation, through its Author and Finisher—will have been triumphantly fulfilled in the exceeding great and precious promises—all nations will be blessed in Abraham and his seed, and in David's Royal Son and Heir—the Christ—the Kingdoms of this world, will have become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Anointed. Righteousness shall reign from sun to sun, and from the river to the ends of the earth—all wars and rumors of war shall cease—every curse, and all evil shall be ultimately removed from our renovated planet—there shall be peace on earth, and good will among men—and redeemed man, exalted to the dignity and glory of the Divine nature, will be in blissful friendship, peace and blessedness with his Maker and Redeemer forever.



SUPPLEMENT.

PART II.

“Who is this uncircumcised Philistine that he should defy the armies of the living God?”

I. Samuel xvii, 26.

“Thinkest thou that I am altogether such an one as thyself?”

Psalm L. 21.

“Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil—that put darkness for light and light for darkness—that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight.”

Isaiah v. 20.



SUPPLEMENT, PART II.

It is not our intention to pursue Mr. Ingersoll through the devious and tortuous track of his labored assaults on the "Christian Religion," in the columns of the *North American Review*, nor is it by any means necessary to do so. We have already seen in the body of this work the small claim he can rightfully urge upon the confidence, or even the respect of the public, by any display of true knowledge or considerate reflection on the subject on which he undertakes so presumptuously and flip-pantly to lecture, to enlighten and to instruct mankind. This is abundantly shewn in the previous chapters, entitled, "*Mr. Ingersoll's Ignorance of the Bible*," page 31—and his "*Inconsistenceis*," page 34, to which the reader is referred. Since the publication of the first edition of this work he has, however, discovered and promulgated a new creed. Mr. Ingersoll is now the founder of two gospels. "The Religion of Humanity" was the substitute he first proposed for the Religion of the Bible. This he defined to be "good fellowship—good friends, etc." *

*See page 25 ante.

This remedial system, however, was all confined to the present short and uncertain life, with no rainbow of promise—no hope of future blessedness—no *beyond* except an eternity of despair, or at best, of universal blank nothingness. Now however he has improved on this Gospel of Nihilism. At the little boy's grave in Washington, he says, as we have seen, "*we too have a religion*. It is help for the living and hope for the dead." Indeed! Has Mr. Ingersoll been reading his Bible at last? Has he at length found or invented a new revelation? Is he become a Christian? "Is Saul also among the prophets?" Has the Ethiopian changed his skin and the leopard his spots? "Help for the living, hope for the dead" is the Christian's creed. He will not deny that the Bible assures us that "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Must we conclude then that in this last departure he has descended to plagiarism, and has stolen the livery of Heaven to serve the Devil in?"

When a disputant is self-stultified—when within the compass of a few revolving moons, he shifts his ground, changes his base, and contradicts his own deliberate utterances, he becomes, "*every thing by turns and nothing long*," and we readily agree with Shakespeare, "Let no such man be trusted." With no stable creed—with no fixed criterion of right and wrong—of truth and error—of light and darkness, a jumble of negations—no wonder that Mr. Ingersoll's light of nature, his boasted "torch of reason," his "Religion of Humanity" should prove a

"shifting equation"—a vanishing quantity—and that he thus stands before us photographed in prophecy, as the shallow pretender who puts "good for evil, darkness for light, bitter for sweet, etc., one who is *only wise* in his own eyes and prudent in his own sight," Such a man is self-condemned.

Mr. Ingersoll and his admirers write and speak of him as if his bitter assaults on the Bible faith were damaging and would ultimately overturn it. Vain hope! Arrogant presumption! It is quite probable that neither he nor they ever read the words of Jesus, "I receive not testimony from man," "There is one that beareth witness of me whom ye know not and his testimony is true." "The Father hath not left me alone. It is my Father that honoreth me, yet ye have not known Him but I know Him, and if I should say I know him not, I should be a liar like unto you; but I know Him, and I keep His sayings. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." "On this rock I build my Church and the gates of hell (the power of the grave) shall not prevail against it," because by the Resurrection, which is the power of God, the Saints shall be redeemed from the gates of hell—*i. e.*, the grave, or death-state.

Surveying the remains of Mr. Ingersoll's sand-bag bat-

tery, after the damaging breaches made in it by Judge Black's artillery, we have left only the crippled guns of human slavery and polygamy, to keep up a straggling, feeble fire against the Bible. It is an easy task to silence these, once for all, for it must strike the intelligent reader with surprise, that in Mr. Ingersoll's formal attack on "*The Christian Religion*," which is the special topic of debate in the REVIEW, he should parade the bygone customs and social habits of another people of time long bygone and of an obsolete system in the Mosaic age, and charge these, even, if admitted to be well founded, as objections to that system, as valid arguments against Christianity, which any one knows, condemns and discards both practices. Surely a tyro in logic and law should know that you cannot convict A of a crime, by proving that B committed it. But as the Bible student is affluent of resources in defense of the truth, we do not care that the assailant shall escape on a special plea however little conclusive. *Polygamy and human slavery were not commanded or approved by the Law of Moses.* The first is recorded in the Mosaic history as a practice among the early patriarchs which descended to their successors, and was followed by Abraham and some of his descendants, but it was never commanded or approved by the God of the Bible. In the beginning God made one woman to be the help-meet and companion of one man—Adam and Eve were man and wife. Never by Divine authority was this law of society changed or repealed. On the contrary, polygamy was discountenanced from the beginning.

In Solomon's case it was expressly condemned, the Bible History testifying that "King Solomon loved many strange women besides his wife, who was Pharaoh's daughter. He had seven hundred wives, who turned away his heart from God, "and the Lord was angry with Solomon." I Kings xi.

In the very words of the Founder of the Christian Faith, and in the uniform teachings of his Apostles, the law of monogamy is expressly enjoined. In the memorable interview with the Pharisees, recorded in Matt. xix, —referred to on page 36 *ante*, the Master denied any Divine authority for polygamy, referring to the creation of a single pair "in the beginning," and calling "the twain one flesh."

As to the remaining charge of human servitude among the Jews, for it is wrong to call it *slavery*, in the modern sense of the term, it was in its original institution, purely a mutual and voluntary contract between the parties—a mutual benefit arrangement, enduring first for a period of seven years, and renewable afterward by mutual consent for a longer period. It rested on the basis of what is, to this day known and legalized by the most humane and enlightened nations, as the contract or apprentice system, the common law-term of seven years in England and a shorter term in the United States, being derived and adopted from the law of Moses. It was in pursuance of this system among the Jews, that Jacob served Laban by contract two terms of *seven* years each, for his

wives Leah and Rachel. See Leviticus xxv, 39-43. Jeremiah xxxiv, 13-16.

It was a wise and benign system. That it may have been perverted and abused by bad men among the Jews—like the apprentice system with us—is quite true, for a law depending upon man's obedience, has seldom been perfectly executed. The system however was entirely free from the just objections to modern slavery. There was no involuntary life-service feature in it nor any hereditary principle binding on the posterity of the enslaved. On the contrary, every seventh year was the year of release, and in the years of jubilee, all were absolutely redeemed and released, whether the contract term had expired or not. Such is the little mole-hill on which Mr. Ingersoll, pandering to well-known popular prejudices, artfully attempts to throw up a huge mountain of reproach and hostility to the Bible.

In the Christendom of the present day the multiplication of religious sects is an ever-increasing evil. Extremes perpetually beget each other. The various religious denominations are built on and animated by the spirit of rival antagonisms. Instead of the one Body—(Church)—one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Hope and the one God the Father of all—a Divine Unity which Christ commanded and the Apostles wisely ordained and established in the beginning, (John xvii,

20-23, Ephesians iv. 3-7,) and the departure from which, as we read in I Corinthians I, 10-15—Paul sternly rebuked, we have now many Churches, many Spirits, “Lords many and Gods many,” so that we closely resemble the idolatrous Athenians, to whom St. Paul preached. Acts xvii. Our Gentile cities boast almost as many altars and temples as the metropolis of Ancient Greece and it is only necessary to converse, with the various worshippers to learn that they too bow at the shrine of an “Unknown God.”

It is undeniable, that such anti-scriptural divisions afford occasion for much of the reproach and scandal with which infidel assailants are ever ready to cover the Christian name and profession. These assailants never stop to enquire whether all this discord is justly chargeable to Christianity itself, and not rather to these perversions and departures from it. Thus the cause of truth is made in the mistaken public opinion, to bear a burden which does not belong to it. Recent religious statistics derived from the best sources, in all nations, show that there are more than one thousand religions in the world, each one separate, distinctive and antagonistic to the other! These things ought not so to be. On the contrary, we should be attracted by the true, and repelled by the false in religion. How shall this be done, in a state of things, in which the truth to attract is not to be found, but only error to repel? The sole remedy for the evil is to be found in the words of the Great Teacher: “Take my yoke upon you and learn of me”—

"Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord and I will receive you and I will be to you a Father and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

The Great Teacher commanded His Disciples to "begin at Jerusalem." We can heed the same wise example, and by sitting at the feet of these Jerusalem teachers we can learn the way of truth and salvation, which they taught and preached. Acts i. x.

The shallowness and folly of infidel opposition to the Bible becomes very conspicuous when we pause and reflect on the absolute necessity of a revelation of God to man.

We know by the experience of our race, that while man by the exercise of those faculties which his Creator has bestowed upon him, may master the secrets of many arts and sciences, which minister to his safety and happiness, and continually add to the sum of human knowledge, there are other sources of learning and instruction which elude his grasp because they are beyond and above the reach of his finite faculties. To the discovery of these, man's mental powers are wholly inadequate.

The science of numbers, of the laws of health, of physiology, anatomy, chemistry, astronomy, geology, etc., are all within man's capacity to learn and comprehend, therefore, we require no revelation to teach them to us and hence as to them the Bible is silent, for revelation would be superfluous and unnecessary. There is, however, another field of enquiry—another class of ideas

as to which man feels the strongest desire to know, while his limited capacities and his finite faculties are unable to grasp them.

It is the thoughtful observation of Lord Macaulay that "As to the question what becomes of man after death, we do not see that a highly educated European, left to his unassisted reason, is more likely to be in the right than a Black-foot Indian. Not a single one of the many sciences in which we surpass the Black-foot Indians throws the smallest light on the state of the soul after the animal life is extinct. In truth, all the philosophers, ancient and modern, who have attempted, *without the help of revelation*, to prove the immortality of man, from Plato down to Franklin, appear to us to have failed deplorably." *Essays*, p. 402.

Thus we see that such questions as those proposed by thoughtful men of all ages: "If a man die shall he live again?" "What shall come to pass hereafter?" "What shall be in the latter days?" "What shall I do to be saved?" "What is life?" "What is death?" and "How we may gain immortality," these are all incapable of answers either by scholastic theology, or by natural religion, and are soluble only by a direct revelation from God Himself?

How supremely unwise then the self-styled *savans* philosophers and theologians to seek answers from Socrates and Plato, Aristotle and Epicurus to whom no *div-*

elation of such secrets has ever been made, and to turn away from Moses and the prophets—Christ and the Apostles—to whom their solution has been confided for our especial information, instruction and guidance.

Such is the broad and striking contrast between the folly and vanity of man even at his best estate and the wisdom and knowledge that come from God only.

But it seems useless to pursue our task further. Mr. Ingersoll unhappily belongs to that class of critics and carpers who remain ignorant, despite the knowledge freely offered them, who never change, even from darkness to light, lest that change should involve an impeachment of their own supreme wisdom. Hence the proverb: "There are none so blind as those who will not see." Nevertheless the word of God stands sure, having this foundation, "The Lord knoweth them that are His."

The Great Dispenser of events, the future Ruler of the earth, and Governor of the nations, thro' His appointed Vice-Gerent, who will come from His right hand on that exalted mission, hath delivered to us that solemn message of truth and warning, addressed to all men by the mouth of His servant David, the sweet Psalmist of Israel. We subjoin this Royal proclamation recorded in Psalm xlix. It is a fitting sequel to our work. Let

the reader heed these words of the Supreme Wisdom and Authority.

“Hear this, all ye people; give ear all ye inhabitants of the world; both high and low; rich and poor together: My mouth shall speak of wisdom, and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding. * * *

* * They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him; that he should still live forever and not see corruption (for the redemption of their soul is precious and it ceaseth forever). For He seeth that wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish and leave their wealth to others. Their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever and their dwelling-places to all generations; They call their lands after their own names. Nevertheless man, being in honor abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish. This, their way is their folly, yet their posterity approve their sayings. Selah.

Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them, and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning, (of the resurrection), and their beauty shall consume in their grave from their dwelling. But

God will redeem my soul (life) from the power of the grave; (saith David) for He shall receive me. Selah.

Be not thou afraid when one is made rich, when the glory of his house is increased; for when he dieth he shall carry nothing away; his glory shall not descend after him. Though while he lived he blessed his soul (and men will praise thee when thou doest well to thyself)—He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light.

Man that is in honor and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish."

THE END.

THE BIBLE DEFENDED AND ATHEISM REBUKED.

REPLY
TO
ROBERT G. INGERSOLL'S LECTURES,

"MISTAKES OF MOSES," "SKULLS," ETC.
"WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?" ETC.

BY
ALLAN B. MAGRUDER,

LAYMAN AND BIBLE STUDENT.

SECOND EDITION,

*With Supplement and Strictures on the Ingersoll-Black Discussion;
Shewing the Bible Doctrine of*

LIFE, DEATH AND IMMORTALITY.

"MAY WE KNOW WHAT THIS NEW DOCTRINE WHEREOF THOU SPEAKEST, IS?
FOR THOU BRINGEST CERTAIN STRANGE THINGS TO OUR EARS; WE WOULD
KNOW THEREFORE WHAT THESE THINGS MEAN."—*Acts xvii, 20.*

CHICAGO ;

C. H. JONES, PUBLISHER.

1882.

Copyright Secured.

50 CENTS.

22

RD-17





DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

DEC 81

ST. AUGUSTINE
FLA.



32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 774 214 7

